

ester

VOLUMEN VIII ENERO DE 1979 NUMERO 1

La redacción de MESTER da fe de su agradecimiento al Graduate Students' Association, University of California, Los Angeles que hizo posible la publicación de este volumen.

Mester se publica dos veces por año, en primavera y en otoño. Las ideas expresadas en sus páginas no siempre son las de la dirección, la cual invita y estimula colaboraciones de cualquier procedencia. No se efectuará la devolución de ningún material que llegue sin sellos postales. Toda colaboración debe seguir el *M.L.A. Style Sheet* y se enviará por duplicado a:

MESTER
Department of Spanish & Portuguese
University of California
Los Angeles, 90024

Condiciones de venta y suscripción:

Suscripción anual	US$ 8
Instituciones	US$12
Suscripción de estudiante	US$ 5
Número suelto (Instituciones)	US$ 6
Número suelto (individuo)	US$ 4



Revista Literaria de los Estudiantes Graduados
DEPARTAMENTO DE ESPAÑOL Y PORTUGUES DE LA
UNIVERSIDAD DE CALIFORNIA EN LOS ANGELES

VOLUMEN VIII — ENERO DE 1979 — NÚMERO 1

ÍNDICE

Portada: Grabado en madera que apareció en *Morgante Maggiore* de Luigi Pulci, publicado por Piero da Pescia en Florencia, 1500. Entresacado de *Bibliographia*, Vol. II, (London: Keegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Company, Limited, 1896). *"Bien hayan aquellos benditos siglos que carecieron de la espantable furia de aquestos endemoniados instrumentos de la artillería, a cuyo inventor tengo para mí que en el infierno se le está dando el premio de su diabólica invención." DON QUIJOTE DE LA MANCHA* I, 38.

El grabado del reverso, *"Noli altum sapere,"* fue reproducido y publicado alrededor de 1527 en París. Entresacado de *Die Bücherornamentik Der Hoch-Und Spätrenaissance*, (Leipzig & Munchen: Verlag von G. Hirth, 1881), Tafel 17.

La redacción de *MESTER* dedica este número a cuatro estimados profesores del Departamento de Español y Portugués de la Universidad de California de Los Ángeles. Los cuatro profesores, John A. Crow, John E. Englekirk, Donald Fogelquist y Aníbal Sánchez Reulet, nos han dejado durante el transcurso de sus carreras académicas valiosos estudios críticos sobre literatura hispanoamericana. Podemos atestiguar que la enseñanza de cada uno de estos profesores ha ampliado nuestra visión y nuestra sensibilidad ante la literatura y lo que en ella se refleja. Incluimos en este número una entrevista con tres de los cuatro; don Aníbal se encontraba en la República Argentina. Esperamos que através de esta dedicación estos maestros reciban el profundo agradecimiento de todos nosotros aseciados con *MESTER* y con el Departamento de Español y Portugués, aquí en Westwood.

assinalatura
(carta a Augusto de Campos)
nabokoviana

voce
primeira
mente poemoumea mente
com mundomusaicosque com
so briedadeprotestantemaldançava so
achando meusoculõesr ealmenteseus achando
o codigoassinalado codificandoosinal o
cularquedesdeprincipioera asemente queambosqueriamospornolar
o sinalcodificadoa ssinalandoocodig o
vendo seusoculhões realmentemeus vendo
so briedadeprotesteadançarque so
nos mundosmusaicos nos
meu spoemasé meu
oderradeiro
voce

Ronald Sousa
University of Minnesota

Eça e Jung: Uma Análise do Onírico e da Arte n'*A Ilustre Casa de Ramires*

À memória de Alberto Machado da Rosa

A terceira e última fase da novelística de Eça de Queirós caracteriza-se em grande parte pela mistura da fantasia com a ironia.[1] Se bem que essa tendência se venha manifestando ao longo da obra do escritor—mesmo nos livros de cunho realista—é só a partir d'*A Ilustre Casa de Ramires*, elaborada pouco antes de sua morte em 1900, que Eça começa a dar-lhe rédea solta.[2]

A própria *Ilustre Casa* é talvez o melhor exemplo disso. António José Saraiva e Óscar Lopes notam que a estrutura do livro se fundamenta no "confronto entre o plano do real e o do fantástico tomado como ideal."[3] Alberto Machado da Rosa assinala a importância do sonho como "elemento definidor" dessa fase da ficção queirosiana e observa que sobretudo neste romance tanto o sonho como a fantasia onírica, traduzida em criação artística pelo protagonista, desempenham um papel especial.[4]

Quanto à ironia, o outro ingrediente da fórmula, na *Ilustre Casa* ela provém mormente da inter-relação e contraste de tal fantasia (o onírico e a arte) com a realidade do protagonista. O autor justapõe a fantasia dos sonhos, devaneios e alucinações de Gonçalo Mendes Ramires com a sua realidade social, contrapondo a ambos a fantasia de uma obra de criação artística supostamente da autoria do próprio Gonçalo. O caráter irônico deriva pois da relativa semelhança/dessemelhança do comportamento de Gonçalo-protagonista com as aspirações oníricas de Gonçalo-sonhador (ou fantasiador) e/ou com o comportamento dos personagens idealizados de Gonçalo-autor.

Parece-nos, porém, que a ironia em si não é o único nem mesmo o principal motivo do emprego pelo autor de tais recursos fantásticos; é apenas um sub-produto. A maior importância dos elementos oníricos e do romance dentro do romance reside antes na sua função compensadora e mesmo catalisadora nas transformações obradas no espírito e na conduta social do protagonista no decurso da narrativa. O presente trabalho visa, portanto, a analisar tal função, valendo-se das teorias do psiquiatra suiço Carl G. Jung como ponto de partida. Logo, passará a considerar algumas hipóteses relativas ao significado simbólico da obra à luz da análise precedente.

Como Freud, Jung aceita a dicotomia consciente/inconsciente.[5] Mas, à diferença do mestre, divide o inconsciente em dois planos: o pessoal e o coletivo (transpessoal). O primeiro plano corresponde *grosso modo*

ao inconsciente freudiano.[6] O segundo plano constitui uma espécie de repositório das lembranças e dos padrões de comportamento herdados do passado animal e ancestral do homem. Todos os seres humanos dispõem de mais ou menos o mesmo inconsciente coletivo, segundo Jung, o que se explica pela semelhança da estrutura cerebral em todas as raças humanas, graças à evolução comum.[7]

Jung chama os elementos herdados de *arquétipos*. São os complexos coletivos, por assim dizer. Mas, enquanto os complexos pessoais só produzem preconceitos pessoais, os arquétipos criam os mitos, as religiões, as filosofias, e chegam a influenciar e a caracterizar povos e épocas históricas. Tanto os complexos pessoais como os arquétipos constituem compensações: os primeiros, de deficiências do consciente individual, e os segundos, de sofrimentos e angústias do gênero humano (i.e., a fome, a guerra, as doenças, a morte, etc). Entre os arquétipos de mais freqüência acham-se a figura do herói, a figura da donzela aflita e o conceito de uma Idade Dourada.

Ao contrário de Freud, Jung atribui ao sonho uma função compensadora e às vezes prospectiva.[8] O sonho é uma mensagem, geralmente codificada em símbolos metafóricos, que se transmite do inconsciente ao consciente, a fim de estabelecer ou manter o equilíbrio psíquico do indivíduo. Como tal, expressa as deficiências dos complexos pessoais deste; manifestam-se através dos arquétipos do inconsciente coletivo No sonho, os arquétipos, que representam as diversas facetas da personalidade humana, aparecem geralmente na forma de projeções sobre as pessoas do ambiente que circunda o indivíduo, mais raramente em figuras quiméricas ou bichos grotescos. Assim, se monta um palco onírico, onde as projeções do inconsciente representam determinados papéis de maneira a compensar as deficiências e a unilateralidade da atitude consciente.

Jung afirma que o papel compensador do sonho pode manifestar-se de várias maneiras, ora em sonhos que representam realizações de desejos reprimidos, ora em sonhos de angústia, ou pesadelos. O sonho pode engrandecer o indivíduo que tem complexo de inferioridade, do mesmo jeito que pode diminuir o indivíduo que tem uma imagem por demais inflada de si mesmo. Às vezes, opera de modo contrário, rebaixando ainda mais o primeiro, e enaltecendo de maneira exagerada o segundo. E, vez por outra, o efeito chega a verificar-se em forma de previsão, já que muitas vezes o inconsciente vê claramente o que o consciente recusa admitir.

Finalmente, Jung reconhece vários outros componentes da psique humana, a saber a *persona*,[9] a *sombra*[10] e a *ânima*.[11] A *persona designa* a máscara social do indivíduo, o seu eu idealizado que ele aparenta para a sociedade, a fim de impressionar e de ocultar a sua natureza autêntica. A *sombra* indica o lado negativo do inconsciente pessoal, os complexos e os demais aspectos repugnantes dentro do indivíduo que ele reprime e que costuma projetar sobre os outros. E a *ânima*, segundo Jung, é o elemento "feminino" dentro de cada homem, um sentimento de fraqueza

e de inferioridade ao seu meio ambiente.[12] Quanto mais o homem procura negar a *ânima*, afirmando o seu ideal de masculinidade, ou seja a sua *persona*, mais "feminino," ou fraco, se torna por dentro. Só atingirá a maturidade psíquica abandonando a *persona* e reconhecendo a *ânima* e os complexos reprimidos como partes de sua personalidade. Jung denomina esse processo *individuação*.[13]

Gonçalo Ramires é um abúlico carente de autoconfiança, o que o impede de realizar tanto as suas aspirações à grandeza e ao heroísmo como os seus anseios de poder e fortuna. Pusilânime e fraco, Gonçalo acha-se incapaz de satisfazer os anelos sem o apoio de outrem, julgando-se um produto mal-fadado de uma "sorte inimiga." Isto o leva a comprometer os próprios valores, aferrando-se até aos inimigos abastados e poderosos por lhe representarem uma das poucas maneiras de derrubar o "muro alto e áspero, sem porta e sem fenda,"[14] o qual ele imagina estorvar-lhe o sucesso almejado. Constituem, por assim dizer, "fendas na muralha."

"Desculpista" por excelência, Gonçalo urde uma teia de ilusões e subterfúgios, a fim de encobrir para si mesmo os motivos da própria incapacidade: a sua falta de vontade e de autoconfiança. A sua mitomania não se limita, porém, às auto-ilusões, cristalizando-se outrossim numa fachada social, a sua *persona*. De modo que ele insiste muito nas aparências de grandeza, nobreza e coragem e chega a contar inúmeras mentiras—tudo para ocultar ao próximo o verdadeiro Gonçalo Ramires.

Até a novela de Gonçalo não passa de uma tentativa de compensar a realidade triste do novelista, que se acha um decadente embora não queira admiti-lo. Por meio dela, ele consegue escapar à realidade mesquinha, identificando-se com os heróicos avós e com os altos valores de uma suposta Idade Dourada.[15] Se o homem é filho de suas obras, Gonçalo Ramires assim pode considerar-se tão filho de uma obra épica literária como o é de uma estirpe nobre. Dessa maneira, pode engrandecer-se tanto nos próprios olhos como nos da sociedade. A novela e a identificação social com os antepassados representam, portanto, outra "fenda na muralha."

Intitulada "A Torre de D. Ramires," a novela baseia-se em grande parte num poemeto em verso solto, escrito há meio século pelo Tio Duarte e que tem por nome "Castelo de Santa Irenéia." Não obstante seu conceito idealizado dos velhos Ramires, Gonçalo pretende verter a poesia romântica do tio para uma prosa de realismo épico, estilo mais de acordo com os tempos modernos. Em se tratando de um tema medieval, vai consultar os romances de Scott e de Herculano. Logo começa a escrever (pp. 16–20).

O enredo da obra gira em torno do avô Tructesindo Ramires, alferes-mor do rei D. Sancho I (1154–1211), e do seu papel nas discórdias entre os herdeiros do rei logo após a morte deste. Por uma promessa feita ao amo, Tructesindo manda o filho Lourenço defender os direitos patrimoniais da infanta D. Sancha contra seu irmão D. Afonso II, que acaba de subir ao trono (pp. 51–53, 55–59). No caminho, Lourenço e os seus

cavaleiros são atacados pelo Bastardo de Baião, que uma vez tentou raptar D. Violante, a filha mais moça de Tructesindo, e que agora comanda a hoste real. Ferem Lourenço e levam-no preso (pp. 119-25). Mais tarde, Baião e companhia aparecem no castelo de Tructesindo com o malferido Lourenço estendido numa liteira. O Bastardo exige a mão de D. Violante em troca da vida de Lourenço. Mas este grita para o pai não aceitar o ultimato e quando Tructesindo o rejeita, Baião mata-lhe o filho (pp. 157-59, 170, 233-43). O resto da narrativa trata de vingança de Tructesindo: do sádico e demorado suplício do Bastardo de Baião (pp. 258-62, 304-06, 311-25).

Os vários segmentos da novela ficam intercalados ao longo do romance, alternando-se muitas vezes com episódios paralelos da vida de Gonçalo, que com eles contrastam ironicamente à maneira de duplicações contrapontísticas. Assim, por exemplo, logo depois que Tructesindo jura cumprir a promessa feita ao finado rei, Gonçalo falta à palavra num negócio com um lavrador a fim de aumentar o próprio lucro (pp. 59-67). Outro tanto ocorre quando Lourenço desafia as ameaças do Bastardo, resolvendo avançar contra as forças inimigas: ameaçado pelo lavrador que ele enganou, Gonçalo foge correndo (pp. 122-30). E assim por diante.

É, de fato, irônico que seja da novela que procede grande parte da ironia da *Ilustre Casa*, pois Gonçalo mesmo não a reconhece. Mas, não nasce exclusivamente das incongruências vindas da comparacão do comportamento social de Gonçalo com o de Tructesindo e Lourenço. Ainda mais irônico é que o novelista *malgré lui* consiga escrever uma épica realista, retratando heróis que não são tão heróicos numa Idade Dourada que não é tão dourada assim. É a verdade que sai do mito já despido dos seus enfeites, e até Gonçalo chega no fim a reconhecê-la.

Em última análise, é justamente o aspecto realista e anti-heróico assumido pela novela para surpresa do novelista que chega a influir na vida deste. Repugnado pela barbárie revelada pelos avós na execução do Bastardo, o Fidalgo da Torre apieda-se do valentão de Nacejas, por ele tão cruelmente surrado há poucos dias (pp. 326-28). Assim, a novela vem a exercer um efeito compensador e terapêutico no pensamento de seu autor.[16]

Ora, é precisamente essa função compensadora que caracteriza também os sonhos e as fantasias conscientes de Gonçalo na *Ilustre Casa*. Ele pode mentir à sociedade e mesmo a si próprio, mas não consegue evitar as verdades exprimidas pelo onírico.

Como retratos simbólicos do seu inconsciente num determinado momento,[17] todos os sonhos de Gonçalo 1) ou revelam os seus desejos inconscientes e recalcados pelo consciente 2) ou são julgamentos pelo seu inconsciente do seu comportamento consciente. Em ambos os casos, mostram-se compensatórios ao estado da vigília do sonhador.

O primeiro fenômeno surge logo no segundo capítulo no sonho com o paraíso africano (p. 50), o qual serve tanto de solução dos tormentos divulgados no primeiro sonho da mesma noite como de antecipação do

que Gonçalo resolverá fazer no final do livro (p. 346). Não sabemos, porém, se este sonho constitui o novelo subliminar de uma futura resolução consciente ou se é apenas o reflexo de uma idéia que tem andado ultimamente nos seus pensamentos conscientes. O que sabemos é que na discussão da África da mesma noite Gonçalo nem opinara favoravelmente sobre ela, preferindo vendê-la, não aos ingleses, mas sim a qualquer "raça fraterna" (p. 35). Sabemos outrossim que, ao acordar, o Fidalgo da Torre não se lembra desse sonho, recordando-se apenas do primeiro pesadelo (p. 50).[18] Em todo caso, o sonho é simbólico de um desejo de fugir das angústias criadas pela própria inércia e incapacidade de agir para a ociosidade e tranqüilidade de um paraíso terrestre carente de tais tormentos, por ele julgados de origem externa. E, com efeito, Gonçalo, dias depois, expressa conscientemente esse desejo numa conversa com a irmã: "Ando com idéias de ir para a África." (p. 89).

A vontade de fugir é também o assunto do pesadelo da mesma noite, o qual exemplifica o segundo tipo de sonho (pp. 49–50). Numa justaposição cômica e fantástica de elementos da sua realidade imediata (sobretudo do jantar de há poucas horas)[19] com os de uma visão romantizada da história dos avós e de Portugal, Gonçalo vê-se acossado por forças inimigas e alheias à própria vontade. É agredido por Cavaleiro e Gouveia (realidade) "revestidos de cotas de malha" (história) e "montados em horrendas tainhas assadas" (jantar do Gago). É acometido por fantasmas lendários ("Fado dos Ramires," composto por um seu conhecido) e arrastado a contragosto para o campo de batalha das Navas de Tolosa (história) pelo rei D. Afonso II, figura histórica e inimigo do avô Tructesindo do poemeto do Tio Duarte. Um seu primo espanhol arranca-lhe os últimos cabelos (Gonçalo aos trinta anos é quase careca),[20] enquanto os sarracenos (história) riem-se dele e a Tia Louredo (que mora em Lisboa) é "trazida como um andor aos ombros de quatro reis" ("Fado dos Ramires").[21]

No entanto, Gonçalo revela-se incapaz de resistir à violência dessas forças adversas. Não contra-ataca, sendo-lhe impossível enfrentá-las sem a ajuda alheia, a qual não acode aos seus gritos de desamparado. Quer fugir, mas nem pode fazer isso; mostra-se impotente e covarde, agindo mais à maneira de uma donzela aflita do que de acordo com os supostos princípios ramíricos. Daí nasce a angústia do pesadelo, conseqüência do recalque pelo consciente do desejo inconsciente. Não é de admirar, portanto, que o sonho constitua uma espécie de condenação por parte do inconsciente do caráter e da conduta de Gonçalo.

Saltando, por enquanto, o sonho de Barrolo, esbarramos com o terceiro sonho de Gonçalo, no capítulo sete, no qual o Fidalgo da Torre procura o avô carniceiro (pp. 217–18). Como o pesadelo, este parte dos devaneios que precedem imediatamente o seu adormecimiento. A busca desse parente carniceiro pelos mais remotos laberintos da história emaranhada e nevoenta é, no fundo, uma tentativa da parte de Gonçalo de penetrar as sinuosidades misteriosas do próprio inconsciente

à cata da faceta mais negra, negativa e recalcada, a sua *sombra*. É a confrontação com a neurose criada pelos próprios instintos reprimidos, seus complexos que ele projeta sobre a figura fantasiada de um avoengo primitivo e longínquo. Assim sendo, é irônico que o avô carniceiro de Gonçalo não seja um açougueiro comum como o pai de D. Ana. Trata-se, pelo contrário, de um carniceiro de carne humana, e nem foi preciso remontar a épocas tão remotas para encontrá-lo, já que tanto Gonçalo como o avô Tructesindo possuem sua cota de sadismo.

De resto, é aparentemente significativo que este sonho, além de tratar da carne humana em sentido sanguinário, esteja ligado com "a formosa e perfumada D. Ana" (p. 218), que apesar de ser filha de um carniceiro reles é objeto da concupiscência (apetite "carnal") do nobre Fidalgo. É de notar, ainda por cima, que o romancista deixa de mencionar a vida sexual do protagonista, que até aqui não desencadeou a violência reprimida, nem através da novela nem através do chicote, optando antes por escapulir-se em face dos perigos reais ou imaginários. Efetivamente, no plano lingüístico, este sonho põe em relevo a imagem da penetração por brenhas e florestas—imagem que, embora não seja necessariamente de ordem erótica, não seja necessariamente de ordem erótica, não deixa de dar indícios de sê-lo.

O último sonho de Gonçalo, um pesadelo em que ele se comunica com os ancestrais, marca uma nova etapa na relação entre sonho e realidade (pp. 278–80). Como no sonho com o avô carniceiro, neste Gonçalo adormece pensando num determinado assunto que continua a remoer além do limiar morfético. Mas, à diferença do sonho anterior, este não resolve nada. Quando acorda, o Fidalgo ainda se lembra do sonho e o chama de "pesadelo" (p. 280), pois faltam-lhe quaisquer elementos cômicos, ao contrário do pesadelo inicial. Também difere do sonho anterior por não tirar nenhuma conclusão definida. O sonho com o avô carniceiro fora uma tentativa de realizar um desejo, e, ao despertar, Gonçalo já não pensava no entrave social a separá-lo de D. Ana, o qual desejara remover antes de dormir. Pois o sonho resolveu tudo. Não é esse, porém, o caso do sonho com as faces dos avós, que é do princípio ao fim um sonho de angústia.

Por fim chegou a hora da confrontação pelo inconsciente de Gonçalo do seu ego abúlico e pusilânime com a sua *persona* heróica e forte—o que o abúlico desejava ser. Acodem os avós (que são projeções idealizadas dessa *persona* forte) a oferecer suas armas a Gonçalo após assistirem à sua jeremiada inútil contra a "sorte inimiga." Mas, no fim do pesadelo, é o ego fraco que faz a pergunta lógica e que não se responde: "Oh Avós, de que me servem as vossas armas—se me falta a vossa alma? . . ." (p. 280). O Fidalgo acorda "toldado de sombras" (p. 280).

Fora naquele mesmo dia que o criado Bento deparara com um velho chicote no sótão, e é no dia seguinte (depois do pesadelo) que Gonçalo vai empregá-lo (pp. 285–87). O aperto dos credores, o aperto de Castanheiro que exige a novela, o saber que D. Ana teve amante e que a

irmã se entregou a Cavaleiro, e finalmente o reconhecimento da própria alma fraca—tudo isso contribui para a brutalidade do chicoteamento do valentão e do amigo. Achando-se acuado pela "sorte inimiga" e precisando aliviar as suas frustrações, Gonçalo acaba por canalizar a energia reprimida num impulso sádico. Vai muito mais além das exigências da legítima defesa, chegando a sentir "uma alegria brutal" (p. 286) ao contemplar os corpos imóveis banhados em sangue.

Ademais, é de notar que a partir desse desencadeamento de frustrações (da energia reprimida), o Fidalgo da Torre pára de mentir, de exagerar os casos que conta às outras pessoas. Não enfeita a sua versão do chicoteamento nem romantiza o suplício do Bastardo de Baião na sua novela. De fato, arrepende-se da violência cometida para com o valentão e da infligida vicariamente ao Bastardo, compadecendo-se dos dois miseráveis. Já é, por conseguinte, como os velhos Ramires: cheios de coragem, mas também de sadismo. Mas, ainda não deixou de iludir-se a si próprio, julgando que sua força recém-descoberta vem de dentro de si, quando na verdade procede de fora—do chicote e do cavalo.

O Fidalgo da Torre já se sente dono de si. Por isso, já não precisa aparentar para a sociedade o que não é nem para si mesmo. Já viu a triste verdade do seu eu abúlico no sonho com os avós e agora acaba de exteriorizar as frustrações reprimidas. Ainda que continue a acreditar na própria força de caráter, pelo menos já entrou no processo de autocompreensção e auto-valorização, o qual culminará nessa tomada de consciência no devaneio da Torre na noite da vitória eleitoral (pp. 340–44).

Diga-se de passagem que é nessa tomada de consciência das mensagens do inconsciente que Gonçalo se diferencia do cunhado José Barrolo. Este, ou por ser um simplório irremediável ou por recalcar a dolorosa suspeita do adultério da mulher, não chega nem a lembrar ou compreender o seu sonho prospectivo (p. 186) nem a dar crédito à denúncia da carta "anônima" das Lousadas mais tarde (pp. 294–95). No primeiro caso, foge-lhe completamente o significado da vassoura onírica que lhe serve, no contexto do sonho, tanto de cacete como de instrumento limpador para que possa repeler e varrer a investida da imundície simbólica, representada pela reconciliação do cunhado com o Cavaleiro dom-juanesco. No segundo caso, preocupa-se unicamente com a possibilidade dos amigos o tacharem de "bacoco," conforme alega a carta. É possível, contudo, que no final do romance se dê conta do acontecido e que seja por isso que derruba o mirante e queima o sofá do pecado no dia do aniversário da mulher (p. 350). Mas, mesmo assim, é bem capaz de estar respondendo apenas às sugestões do inconsciente, sem compreender conscientemente o motivo verdadeiro de tal destruição.

Com efeito, não escapa a Gonçalo o significado compensador, prospectivo e até parcialmente corretivo dos seus sonhos. Embora pareça esquecer alguns ao acordar (p. ex., o sonho com o paraíso africano e

o com o avô carniceiro), as resoluções e os julgamentos feitos oniricamente pelo seu inconsciente acabam por influenciar mais tarde as suas intenções e ações conscientes (p. ex., a decisão de rumar para a África e a de arrastar a asa para D. Ana).

De forma que os sonhos do Fidalgo servem de representações visuais das bases inconscientes dos seus problemas. Condensam e até sobrepõem, umas às outras, situações reais e fantasiadas, associadas pelo inconsciente e que são no fundo projeções sobre figuras do mundo externo das múltiplas facetas que atuam no seu drama interior. Partindo amiúde dos devaneios que os precedem imediatamente, tomam as preocupações dessas fantasias conscientes. E chegam a tirar conclusões que redundarão em ações reais e em atitudes conscientes—e, às vezes, em outros devaneios que, por sua vez, suscitarão outros sonhos. Tal é o caso, por exemplo, dos devaneios e ações que ligam o primeiro sonho de Gonçalo, exposição inicial do seu drama interior, ao sonho com os ancestrais, passo adiante no seu processo conscientizador.

Mas o papel compensador que vimos descrevendo não se cinge tão-somente à novela e aos sonhos do romance. Manifesta-se também nos devaneios e nas alucinações. O papel compensador dos devaneios, ou fantasias conscientes,[22] é posto em relevo pelo primeiro exemplo, em que Gonçalo, antes do sonho inicial, contempla o seu fracasso e as suas possibilidades de atingir o sucesso na vida (pp. 27–29). É aqui que aparece pela primeira vez o "muro alto e áspero, sem porta e sem fenda" (p. 28), que ele acha produto da sorte adversa e que lhe atrapalha a passagem para o ansiado sucesso político. Sentindo-se incapaz de transpor o "muro" por conta própria e vendo-se desamparado de qualquer proteção, considera que quase o único "buraquinho, bem apertado mas serviçal" é escrever e publicar a história épica dos nobres antepassados. Apoiando-se neles e no poemeto do Tio Duarte, talvez consiga ampliar a brecha a ponto de poder alcançar as metas políticas.

Essa imagem consciente do muro impenetrável, que se repete ao longo dos devaneios, está muito ligada ao primeiro sonho, na medida em que também exprime, conquanto de maneira menos dramática e mais lógica, a abulia do Fidalgo que ele atribui ao destino e à falta de apoio externo. Como o primeiro sonho, então, representa uma espécie de exposição inicial do drama interior do protagonista, compensando a sua falta de vontade e de segurança.

Mas, se a compensação que se evidencia no primeiro devaneio de Gonçalo constitui um mecanismo de defesa para afastar a culpa de si (como o é também o sonho inicial), a compensação do devaneio final é de outra índole (pp. 340–44). Essa tomada de consciência da própria abulia ao contemplar a Torre iluminada e as estrelas do firmamento desempenha, como sugerimos acima, uma função reveladora. É aqui que o Fidalgo da Torre chega finalmente a ver-se tal qual é, a compreender seu próprio valor despido de enfeites e de valores alheoios.

A função compensadora das alucinações, ou lapsos momentâneos do

consciente,[23] aparece no episódio em que Gonçalo descobre o adultério de Gracinha. Assim, o Fidalgo, depois de ouvir as vozes da irmã e da Cavaleiro no mirante, mas impedido de vê-los, continua a "perceber" seus murmúrios—mas fortes e ululantes, a alastrar-se por toda Oliveira (pp. 250–51). E, logo depois, ainda aturdido e envergonhado, tem "a sensação que o mundo tremera, e as mais fortes almas se abatiam, e a sua Torre, velha como o Reino, rachava, mostrando dentro um montão ignorado de lixo e de saias sujas" (p. 251).

Neste caso, trata-se de uma reação ao estímulo traumático criado pelo repentino descobrimento da infidelidade conjugal da irmã. A alucinação expressa a preocupação do Fidalgo de que a entrega de Gracinha a Cavaleiro venha a saber-se. Mas, também expressa o seu medo de que o próprio drama interno se publique.

Em termos jungueanos, o drama interno de Gonçalo consiste na sua "entrega" da ânima fraca à sombra reprimida do seu inconsciente. É o que se patenteia tanto nos seus sonhos e fantasias conscientes como na sua novela e vida. Quanto mais procura afirmar a *persona* nobre, viril e forte, reprimindo os "traços femininos" de fraqueza, falta de vontade e sentimentalismo, mais "efeminado" (i.e., inseguro) se torna no seu íntimo. Desesperado, procura compensar a falta de "masculinidade," recorrendo à violência, a qual também procurara reprimir no princípio por ser incompatível com seu conceito idealizado de si mesmo. Mas a violência, por sua vez, provoca outra compensação: a pena que ele vem a ter da vítima sob a influência de sua *ânima*. E, afinal de contas, a violência também constitui uma fraqueza, porquanto reflete a sua insegurança interior.

Tal drama se exprime de várias formas e através de vários arquétipos na novela, nos sonhos e nas fantasias conscientes do Fidalgo. Ele identifica-se ora com a figura do herói (projeção da *persona* idealizada), ora com a figura da donzela aflita (projeção da *ânima*), ora com a figura do vilão (projeção de uma parte da *sombra*). Recria Idades Douradas, sonha com paraísos terrestres e procura ogros—tudo numa tentativa de realizar-se.

Afinal, Gonçalo Ramires chega a admitir a falsidade da *persona* e a aceitar tanto o aspecto "feminino" como o aspecto sádico de sua personalidade como facetas normais da psique humana. Entra no processo de auto-realização psíquica que Jung chama *individuação*, o que se deve principalmente ao efeito terapêutico de sua arte e de sua vida onírica.

A aparente aplicabilidade dos conceitos jungueanos à *Ilustre Casa*, sobretudo no que diz respeito aos sonhos, parece confirmar a modernidade da interpretação eciana do espírito humano. Mas também provoca uma série de perguntas sobre o significado simbólico da obra, na medida em que este for sujeito à mesma dialética compensatória do plano individual.

Se Gonçalo Ramires representa Portugal, como afirma João Gouveia na última página do livro (p. 362), podemos deduzir logicamente que

Eça queria atribuir à pátria através da analogia qualidades tais como a abulia, a fraqueza, a dependência externa, a fé sebastianista, o complexo de inferioridade, o pseudo-machismo e talvez mesmo a paranóia.[24] Teria desejado assinalar sua tendência a viver num passado heróico, dormindo sobre os louros de antanho e, ao mesmo tempo, comparando-se desfavoravelmente com os valores ideais de uma história nacional altamente romantizada. Demais, teria pretendido ilustrar a sua situação enquanto objeto—não sujeito—de sua existência. Entretanto, que significado simbólico havemos de associar aos sonhos e às fantasias de Gonçalo? Se servem de contrapeso a compensar-lhe a vida medíocre, quais os seus análogos no tocante a Portugal? Podemos deduzir a homologia de sonho:Gonçalo::mito:Portugal?[25] E, se pudermos, é lídimo atribuirmos ao mito a mesma função potencialmente terapêutica que Jung atribui ao sonho? Finalmente, qual a relação entre a partida de Gonçalo para a África e o processo que Jung chama *individuação* e quais as suas implicações no plano simbólico?

Não compete ao presente ensaio responder a essas perguntas em todas as suas particularidades, por merecerem de per si todo um estudo à parte. No entanto, convém aventar várias hipóteses sobre as intenções simbólicas do romancista. Parece inegável que Eça quis apontar com Gonçalo Ramires não somente os defeitos de Portugal mas também a maneira de retificá-los. Quis mostrar os complexos nacionais à guisa de complexos individuais, servindo-se para tanto dos arquétipos comuns. Mas esperava igualmente sugerir um caminho pelo qual o país pudesse redimir-se.

A solução não se podia encontrar numa visão artificial da própria história, por mais compensatória que fosse à situação real do país. E, mesmo que fosse verídica historicamente, tal visão não era adequável à atualidade, não passando a sua perspectiva aristocrática de mais um anacronismo esquecido pelo tempo. Nem ao menos se podia achar no caráter compensador dos mitos e das lendas do país, a não ser que se tivesse conhecimento da maneira de interpretá-los corretamente. Só mesmo sabendo o que procurar na história, nos mitos e nas lendas nacionais é que se poderia chegar a reconhecer e eliminar os complexos coletivos do povo português.

Diga-se de passagem que o aspecto mesquinho que os críticos imputam com freqüência à trasladação do protagonista para a África no final do romance só parece aumentar-se com a reformulação em termos simbólicos.[26] Pretender que a falta de ânimo de um país pode solucionar-se mediante novas aventuras colonialistas não é das soluções mais diretas e dignas de elogio, seja qual for a atitude predominante da época. E, ironicamente, parece constituir um outro tipo de avasão, por sinal desnecessária—pelo menos no plano individual—pois já no momento da partida Gonçalo parece ter aproveitado a mensagem compensatória do onírico e da arte.

Em resumo, é evidente que Eça serve-se dos chamados elementos

fantásticos por motivos que de longe ultrapassam os possíveis efeitos irônicos. A função compensadora que ele confere aos sonhos, às fantasias e ao romance atribuídos ao protagonista contribui para modificar o pensamento e o comportamento deste de maneira terapêutica. Mais ainda, comprova a atualidade da compreensão queirosiana do sonho e de seu papel na psique humana. E, finalmente, chega a figurar na interpretação simbólica da obra.

Quanto às idéias de Jung, convém assinalar que não constituem a única maneira de abordar o onírico e a arte da *Ilustre Casa*, se bem que concorram admiravelmente para a explicação de tais fenômenos. A sua grande vantagem estriba-se, afinal de contas, não somente na teoria da compensação dos sonhos, mas também na visão arquetípica do universo que fornecem, a qual possibilita a integração dos múltiplos planos da realidade dentro do romance. Que Eça tenha compreendido desde cedo a importância de tal integração é um dos fatores mais significativos da sua originalidade como ficcionista. E é dessa compreensão que decorre, sobretudo nas últimas obras, a chamada veia fantástica que tanto o distingue dos seus contemporâneos.

Bobby J. Chamberlain
Michigan State University

NOTAS

1. Segundo Alberto Machado da Rosa (*Eça, Discípulo de Machado?* Rio: Fundo de Cultura, 1963, p. 164), a originalidade de Eça sempre se baseou na fundição dos dois elementos: ironia e fantasia.

2. António José Saraiva e Óscar Lopes (*História da Literatura Portuguesa*, 6ª ed., corrigida e actualizada, Porto: Porto, s.d., pp. 909–13) tratam o elemento fantástico na obra de Eça anterior à *Ilustre Casa*, observando-o no seu pendor para a distorção caricatural, em certas cenas e personagens fantasmagóricos, na sua veia satânica, na sua linguagem amiúde deformadora e na sua agnóstica ironização de tudo, tanto nos romances supostamente realistas como em obras menos realistas tais como *O Mandarim* (1880) e *A Relíquia* (1887). Aliás, deve-se lembrar a epígrafe que preambula esta última: "Sobre a nudez forte da verdade—o manto diáfano da fantasia."

3. Ibid., p. 913.

4. Rosa, p. 166.

5. Salvo nos casos de indicação contrária, as fontes donde procedem as informações sobre as teorias de Jung são Carl G. Jung, "Approaching the Unconscious," in *Man and His Symbols*, ed. Carl G. Jung (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1964), pp. 18–103, e Nise da Silveira, *Jung: Vida e Obra* (Rio: José Álvaro, 1968).

6. O inconsciente pessoal consta, segundo Jung, 1) de elementos esquecidos pelo consciente, 2) das percepções subliminares (que não possuem a força psíquica suficiente para entrarem no consciente), 3) das idéias criadas no inconsciente e que ainda não passaram ao consciente e 4) dos complexos do indivíduo (Carl G. Jung, *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*, trans. R.F.C. Hull, 2nd ed., Bollingen Series, Vol. 20, No. 7, Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1966, p. 66).

7. No seu livro *The Savage Mind* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1966, p. 65), Claude Lévi-Strauss refuta a existência dos arquétipos e do inconsciente coletivo, observando que só as formas—e não os conteúdos—é que são comuns às várias culturas: em outro trabalho, Lévi-Strauss argumenta que, ao formular a noção do arquétipo, Jung comete o erro de esquecer o princípio saussuriano da arbitrariedade do signo ("The Structural Study of Myth," *Journal of American Folklore*, 78, No. 270, Oct.-Dec., 1955, pp. 428-44; reimpresso in *The Structuralists: From Marx to Lévi-Strauss*, ed. Richard T. De George e Fernande M. De George, Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor, 1972, p. 172); Northrop Frye (*Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*, Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1957, pp. 111-12) considera a existência do consciente coletivo desnecessária à noção do arquétipo na crítica literária.

8. Numa comparação dos métodos seguidos por Freud e Jung na interpretação dos sonhos, Erich Fromm nos informa que Freud sempre conservou a teoria de que a única função do sonho, além da de preservar o estado morfético, era a realização dos desejos reprimidos (Erich Fromm, *The Forgotten Language: An Introduction to the Understanding of Dreams, Fairy Tales and Myths*, New York: Grove, 1951, p. 95); para mais informações sobre tal teoria, veja-se Sigmund Freud, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, trans. A.A. Brill, rev. ed. (London: Allen and Unwin; New York: Macmillan, 1937), pp. 140, 150-67.

9. Jung entende por *persona* "a complicated system of relations between the individual consciousness and society, fittingly enough a kind of mask, designed on the one hand to make a definite impression upon others, and, on the other, to conceal the true nature of the individual" (Jung, *Two Essays*, p. 192); veja-se também a esse respeito Silveira, p. 89.

10. Sobre este ponto, veja-se M.-L. von Franz, "The Process of Individuation," in *Man and His Symbols*, ed. Carl G. Jung, pp. 168-76.

11. Para um tratamento mais completo da *ânima* jungueana, veja-se M.-L. von Franz, pp. 176-88; o *ânimus*, contrapartida masculina da *ânima* que compensa a psique feminina, segundo Jung, é examinado logo em seguida pelo mesmo estudioso (pp. 189-95).

12. Não é de admirar que Jung tenha sido alvo de críticas feministas recentes por suas idéias "sexistas." De fato, parece-nos desnecessário e mesmo contraproducente postular a feminilidade ou masculinidade *inerente* de determinadas qualidades, cujas associações sexuais tradicionais se podem explicar mais convincentemente como sendo resultados do acondicionamento cultural. A prática torna-se discriminatória na medida em que a sociedade atribuir a tais qualidades valores positivos ou negativos. Felizmente, a validez da interpretação jungueana não parece depender de semelhante distinção.

13. Veja-se, a esse respeito, o referido artigo de M.-L. von Franz.

14. [José Maria] Eça de Queirós, *A Ilustre Casa de Ramires*, 6ª ed., (Lisboa: Livros do Brasil, s.d.), p. 28. Todas as referências à *Ilustre Casa* serão desta edição, figurando as indicações de página como notas parentéticas dentro do texto; sobre a sede do poder e da fama, veja-se Fromm, pp. 34-35.

15. Para Jung, no contexto do sonho, "hobnobbing with Napoleon and being on speaking terms with Alexander the Great are exactly the kind of fantasies produced by an inferiority complex" ("Approaching the Unconscious," p. 63); observe-se, a propósito, que dentro do mundo fictício do romance, os nobres avós de Gonçalo Ramires são figuras de tamanho realce.

16. Da mesma forma que os sonhos vindos do inconsciente pessoal compensam a unilateralidade do consciente pessoal, a expressão artística constitui um esforço do inconsciente coletivo por compensar o consciente coletivo, ou "cânon cultural" de uma determinada sociedade numa determinada época, segundo afirma o jungueano Erich Neumann, *Art and the Unconscious: Four Essays*, trans. Ralph Manheim, Bollingen Series, Vol. 61 (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1969). Acrescenta que o artista ou escritor "fulfills not only himself but also his epoch" (p. 97).

17. Veja-se Carl G. Jung, *The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*, trans. R.F.C. Hull, 2nd ed., Bollingen Series, Vol. 20, No. 8 (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1969), p. 263.

18. Fromm (op. cit. p. 28) ocupa-se do esquecimento dos sonhos, comparando-o com o desaparecimento dos fantasmas noturnos com os primeiros raios do sol em muitos mitos populares; cf. Freud, pp. 472–91.

19. Freud assevera que "in every dream we may find some reference to the experiences of the preceding day" (op. cit., p. 167).

20. Fromm (op. cit., p. 69) lembra que, segundo Freud, a perda do cabelo é uma representação simbólica da castração.

21. Segundo Jung, as idéias e imagens contidas no inconsciente conservam-se sob pouca tensão psíquica e são, portanto, mais vagas e nebulosas que as do consciente, sem muita interrelação de causa e efeito, menos racionais. Assim, pode-se compreender "why dreams often express themselves as analogies, why one dream image slides into another, and why neither the logic nor the time scale of our waking life seems to apply" ("Approaching the Unconscious," p. 64); cf. Fromm, p. 28.

22. Jung considera a fantasia consciente como a manifestação mais óbvia da intrusão dos processos inconscientes no consciente (Jung, *Structure*, p. 142).

23. A alucinação representa, na voz de Jung (*Structure*, p. 307), "the momentary irruption of an unconscious content" no consciente.

24. Compare-se, nesse particular, com a Geração de 98 espanhola.

25. Joseph Campbell (*The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, 2nd ed., Bollingen Series, Vol. 17, Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1968, p. 19) sustenta que "dream is the personalized myth, myth the depersonalized dream; both myth and dream are symbolic in the same general way of the dynamics of the psyche"; da mesma maneira, J.E. Cirlot (*A Dictionary of Symbols*, trans. Jack Sage, New York: Philosophical Library, 1962, p. xxiv) afirma que "what a myth represents for a people, for any one culture, or for any given moment in history, is represented for the individual by the symbolic images of dreams, by visions and by fantasy or lyricism."

26. A partida de Gonçalo Ramires para a África é, no opinião de António Sérgio, a prova de que, mesmo no final do romance, suas aspirações não passam da ambição burguesa do poder e da fortuna (António Sérgio, "Notas sobre a Imaginação, a Fantasia e o Problema Psicológico-Moral na Obra Novelística de Eça de Queiroz," in *Livro do Centenário de Eça de Queiroz*, Lisboa: Dois Mundos, 1945, pp. 449–502).

Guzmán de Alfarache and Paradise

Since the beginning of Western literature, the garden has been a recurrent image. In Classical times it was a "place of spiritual repose and bodily ease . . . a scene of shade, song and love."[1] In Christian times the garden became strongly associated with the Earthly Paradise and Man's Fall from grace. During the Renaissance, many writers concerned themselves with the deceitful nature of the garden, which had come to be, in effect, an illusory Paradise. We can observe this in Mateo Alemán's *Guzmán de Alfarache*, where, despite the few descriptions of the garden, it becomes a fundamental motif because of its association with the Biblical Paradise and the Fall of Man.

Mircea Eliade discusses Paradise as a manifestation of the symbolism of the center in *Images and Symbols*.[2] He states that "every microcosm, every inhabited region, has what may be called a 'centre.' That is to say, a place sacred above all" (p. 39). He elaborates on how ancient man conceived of and constructed these sacred places, which assume many different forms, such as temples, cities and even houses. He further states that both ancient and modern man have shown the desire to be at the heart of reality and the sacred, in other words, at the "Centre of the World, the place of communication with Heaven" (p. 54).[3]

Adam, the first man, dwelt at the center of the cosmos, "the navel of the earth" (p. 43), which is commonly known as Paradise. Man's archetypal desire to be at the center of the world is a manifestation of his Nostalgia for Paradise. Eliade calls this "the desire to *find oneself* always and without effort in the Centre of the World, at the heart of reality, and by short cut and in a natural manner to transcend the human condition" (p. 55). In Christian terms this is called man's condition before the Fall.[4]

I should like to propose that the protagonist of *Guzmán de Alfarache* follows the universal pattern of the rite of the center, which, as Eliade has elaborated, is an archetype based on universal archaic symbolism and in this particular case is the Christian "myth" of man in Paradise. For Christian man, Paradise is the ultimate center, although man also constructs other centers which are in essence replicas of Paradise; they serve to isolate or protect man from the profane world. In *Guzmán de Alfarache* the protagonist is inevitably attracted toward these centers, but, as we shall see, never succeeds in remaining there.

Paradise in the Judeo-Christian tradition is known as the Garden of Eden. The first three chapters of Genesis deal with the Garden and with the expulsion of Adam and Eve. Interest in Genesis peaked during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when there was a veritable explosion of literary works that treated the question of Paradise and the Fall of Man. Approximately one hundred and fifty of these works

appeared in Europe at this time.[5] One must keep in mind that man considered himself to be only six thousand years away from the Earthly Paradise and consequently the concept was not nearly so abstract as it is in present times. Although Spanish and Portuguese discoveries and explorations dampened much of the speculation about an Earthly Paradise still existent somewhere in the unexplored world, an interest in fixing the location of the Biblical Paradise remained.[6]

Interestingly enough, the best known writer on Paradise during the late sixteenth century was a Spaniard, Benedictus Pererius (Benito Pereyra, Pereyra of Valencia, c. 1535–1610), a Jesuit lecturer at the Collegium Romanum. Between 1589 and 1598, four volumes of his *Commentarium et Disputationum in Genesim* appeared.[7] Alemán was writing the *Guzmán* during this same period and may have in some manner come into contact with Pererius's work, or with the exegeses of other commentators.[8] In any case, the nature and location of Paradise was an important issue in both Catholic and Protestant Europe, and it is therefore not surprising that the Paradise motif should be found in *Guzman de Alfarache*.

In this work, Paradise is first mentioned in the second chapter. Guzmán describes a garden which passes unnoticed until one considers the scarcity of descriptions of this nature. Rarely does Guzmán take notice of his natural surroundings, yet when he does, the author has a purpose in mind:

> Era entrado el verano, fin de mayo, y el pago de Gelves y San Juan de Alfarache el más deleitoso de aquella comarca, por la fertilidad y disposición de la tierra, que es toda una, y vecindad cercana que le hace el río Guadalquivir famoso, regando y calificando con sus aguas todas aquellas huertas y florestas. Que con razón, si en la tierra se puede dar conocido paraíso, se debe a este sitio el nombre dél: tan adornado está de frondosas arboledas, lleno y esmaltado de varias flores, abundante de sabrosos frutos, acompañado de plateadas corrientes, fuentes espejadas, frescos aires y sombras deleitosas, donde los rayos del sol no tienen en tal tiempo licencia ni permisión de entrada.[9]

This garden, or "paraíso," is an obvious reference to the Creation myth. It is here that Guzmán's mother concerts to meet his father. Superficially we have an idealistic, bucolic scene that is conducive to love and recalls the *locus amoenus* of pastoral literature. One might call this the *parecer* of the scene. However, what occurs here is hardly idealistic. A pretty young woman, engaged in a meretricious relationship with a gentleman many years her senior, is attracted to an effeminate, corrupt Genoese. While passing by his house, the mother feigns a stomach-ache and, according to plan, is put into the father's bed while her elderly keeper waits in another room. The father then comes out of hiding and Guzmanillo is conceived while his mother wrestles with intestinal disturbances. The reader may safely come to the conclusion that the protagonist has been conceived in rather sinful circumstances.

This conception account has a mythical quality that is reminiscent of the Biblical Creation myth as well as of the Nativity of Christ. A. A. Parker calls this scene a "symbolic picture."[10] Both the Creation and Nativity accounts have a certain mythical, symbolic quality that sets them apart from the rest of the Bible, which is largely historical, lyrical or didactic in focus. Both the Old and New Testaments begin on a mythical note. Alemán also does this in *Guzmán de Alfarache* and thereby links both the New and Old Testament myths.

The scene with Guzmán's mother riding an ass, holding her stomach in pain, looking for a place to rest, recalls the Biblical scene of the Virgin Mary, with child, searching for lodging in Bethlehem. Significantly, the first words of the maid who answers the door are "¡Jesús! ¡Ay Dios!" (p. 130).

This scene could also be considered a re-elaboration of the myth of Adam and Eve. It is very interesting to note that Guzmán's father first espies his mother at a baptism, the Christian ritual for the washing away of original sin. Ironically, these two then form an illicit union which produces a child born out of wedlock and tainted by original sin. It is also worth noting that Guzmán makes no mention of his own baptism. His original sin stays with him. His early years with his mother are his edenic period; he is blemished by original sin but remains sheltered by his mother and protected by the innocence of his youth. At the age of twelve, upon reaching manhood, Guzmán must leave his home and innocence behind, thus being symbolically expelled from the garden.

Alemán use of Biblical myths is quite disconcerting when one considers the apparently orthodox nature of much of the work. His interpretation verges on an irreverent parody. If one makes direct associations such as Mary-Eve=strumpet, Joseph=cuckold, Adam=homosexual and Christ=illegitimate child, the story becomes clearly blasphemous. Yet, I doubt that this was Alemán's intent. The author holds a very negative view of the world in which he lives, and writes in an embittered, tense style—a truly idyllic scene would be out of place. (We shall see idyllic love in "Ozmín y Daraja," which as an intercalated piece, does not form an absolutely integral part of the work.) Alemán reinterprets these stories in a profane manner because this interpretation corresponds to his view of the world. He does not wish to cheapen or denigrate the original characters. To the contrary, his intention is to present *his* characters in an unfavorable light.

The scene in which Guzmán meets his second wife, Gracia, is similar in many respects to the scene in which his parents meet. His wife's name is an indirect reference to the Paradise motif. Just as man in Eden lived in a state of grace, Guzmán attempts to regain this state in his marriage to Gracia. He calls this marriage, "el medio de mi salvación." (p. 845) In this scene, Guzmán enters a church and blesses himself with holy water in a less than devout manner. This practice is an invocation of

God's grace and is analogous to baptism. Yet, because of his impious attitude, he fails to remove sin or to invoke divine grace. He instead pursues a more corporeal form (Gracia). Significantly, it was at a baptism that Guzmán's father first viewed his mother, just as here Guzmán sets eyes upon Gracia for the first time. Similarly, they move on to a bucolic *merienda* scene which recalls the events surrounding Guzmán's conception at San Juan de Alfarache:

> se fueron por entre los álamos adelante a la orilla del río y sobre un pradillo verde, haciendo alfombra de su fresca yerba, se sentaron en ella (p. 816).

Once more we have the "eternal pair." When Guzmán marries, he says,

> Volvíme a casar segunda vez muy con mi gusto y tanto que que tuve por cierto que nunca por mí se comenzara el tocino del paraíso y que fuera el hombre más bienaventurado de la tierra (p. 827).

Paradise is again mentioned and Guzmán experiences a second edenic period. "Tuve días muy alegres," he says (p. 827). His first edenic period, we recall, was spent at his mother's side; here he wishes to repeat it at his wife's. It is not long, however, before Guzmán and Gracia fall from grace and are forced to leave Alcalá. When they arrive in Madrid, Gracia is depicted riding an ass as they seek lodging. The scene recalls the Nativity story as well as that of Guzmán's mother's feigning illness:

> Cuando le dije que allí no más y que no teníamos posada cierta, profesando hacernos amistad, nos llevó a la de una su conocida, donde nos hicieron todo buen acogimiento: no por el asno, sino por la diosa (p. 835).

The fact that he refers to his wife as "la diosa" is not without significance, nor is the fact that princes bearing gifts soon appear at their door. Again we have a synthesis of the Creation and Nativity stories, Guzmán being a Joseph-Adam figure and Gracia a Mary-Eve figure, as his parents were.

In Madrid Gracia continues prostituting herself with her husband's consent and they are eventually expelled from that city. They move on to Seville, where Gracia leaves Guzmán, who, in turn, returns to his mothei .

This expulsion, as well as the original one, has fairly obvious symbolic overtones. Man, conceived in sin and apparently condemned to sin, cannot remain in Paradise. It is particularly significant that Guzmán and Gracia should have been banished by a judge because Guzmán refers to judges as "dioses de la tierra" (p. 616).[11]

Another of the rare garden scenes appears in 2ª, I, 4 in the story of don Alvaro de Luna:

> Una vez déstas, habiéndose alargado y detenido algo más de su ordinario por un alegre jardín que a la orilla del río Pisuerga estaba, recreándose de ver su varia composición, hermosas flores, alegres arboledas y sabrosas frutas, entró el calor, de manera que, temiendo la vuelta y con el gusto de tanta recreación, determinó quedarse gozándola hasta la noche (p. 524).

Joseph Ricapito discusses some of the similarities between this garden scene and San Juan de Alfarache: "Descriptions such as these are not very frequent in el *Guzmán* and the fact that both these episodes begin on this note should have some significance."[12]

In this story a young countess is forced by her family to marry an older man. She arranges to meet her true love, don Luis, while her husband is away. Unexpectedly he returns and she leaves him in bed in order to meet her lover. Don Rodrigo, a friend of Luis's, is sent to take the countess's place in bed. The following morning don Rodrigo wakes up to find himself in bed with the countess's sister, not with her husband. He curses himself for having missed such an opportunity for love.

Several aspects of this story recall the relationship between Guzmán's parents. The countess's marriage to an older man for financial reasons reminds one of Guzmán's mother's relationship with the old *caballero*. The adulterous scheme also recalls how Guzmán's mother deceived her elderly lover. The unexpected return of the countess's husband is a reversal of the San Juan de Alfarache story, but, in both, the illicit acts occur while the husband-keeper is in an adjacent room. Ricapito points out all of this and adds, ". . . is it not possible to see in this episode a treatment and an additional perspective of his mother's illicit adventures?"[13] Again in this scene we have a somewhat idealistic *parecer* (jardín, condes, caballeros, condesas) which, when penetrated, reveals a very different *ser*. In all three of these garden scenes there has been some kind of illicit, sinful love, either promiscuous or extramarital.[14]

In the intercalated novellette, "Ozmín y Daraja," the garden figures prominently as the meeting place of the two Moorish lovers. Here the garden regains its more traditional literary function; it is a place of intimacy that foments love, similar to the *locus amoenus*. Compared to the other characters in this work, both Ozmín and Daraja are idealized, as is their love. There is nothing profane about Alemán's treatment of this Moorish couple; they represent an almost fantasized view of perfect love.[15] This appearance of the garden stands in marked contrast to the author's use of the garden in the rest of the work.

Guzmán's life is a series of expulsions from this "garden." If he is not directly thrust out of a city or a household, he always finds himself in a position that somehow calls for his leaving. He is searching for a center, his motivation in life being to arrive at the center, to use Eliade's terminology. In fact, most of the cities visited by Guzmán are important centers. He is born in Seville, the center of the Spanish Empire, the city which serves as a link between the Old World and the New. He is

attracted to Madrid, the center of Spanish government, as well as to Toledo, the center of ecclesiastical authority. He twice passes through Genoa, the commercial center of the Mediterranean and the origin of Guzman's family. He goes to Rome, the center of the Catholic world, and spends seven years in Alcalá de Henares, the new center of Spanish learning.

In 1ª, I, 3, Guzmán says, "Alentábame mucho el deseo de ver mundo, ir a reconocer en Italia mi noble parentela" (p. 146). He is drawn toward the origin of his family, which is, for him, one of the Centers of the World. His life is, in essence, a series of journeys toward the past. Even when he is physically moving forward, spiritually he is moving backward by attempting to approach a state of innocence or dependence on a superior figure. He constantly looks for a master—one to whom he can subordinate himself, one under whose good graces he might live, as Adam lived in Paradise. Until the Fall, Adam never had to choose between good and evil. Guzmán, on the other hand, as a fallen man, must make this choice and inevitably opts for evil.

As the name the protagonist adopts indicates, he identifies himself with the two centers of his origin. The mother is an obvious garden-fertility symbol (see note 4) and Guzmán assumes his mother's name rather than his father's. His second name, Alfarache, is the name of his birthplace, the "paradise" in which he was conceived.

Guzmán's preoccupation with his center affects the whole course of his existence, the nature of which he apparently does not understand. At one point he states, "yo voy por el mundo sin saber adonde y lo mismo dirán de mí" (p. 788). Yet almost contradictorally he says,

> Mas, como el fin que llevo es fabricar un hombre perfeto, siempre que hallo piedras para el edificio, las voy amontonando. Son mi centro aquestas ocasiones y camino con ellas a él (p. 557).

According to Christian tradition there have been only two perfect men, Christ and Adam before the Fall. Both were innocent and both were associated with Guzmán in the two major incidents that deal with Paradise. Guzmán's rationalization of his own life is (in retrospect in any case) a conscious attempt to mold himself into a perfect man. But there are no visible manifestations of this. Unconsciously, though, this manifests itself as a nostalgic desire to return to a state of innocence, which was man's condition in Paradise before the Fall.

On a concrete level, Guzmán's life is aimless; he fluctuates between success and failure and never consistently improves at any of his endeavors during the course of the work. One might expect a *pícaro* with fixed goals to perhaps aspire to becoming a Micer Morcón, a prince amongst rogues. Guzmán, however, resorts back to petty thievery at the end of the work.

As we have seen, Guzmán is consistently denied the opportunity of

finding a comfortable "niche" in life. His expulsions are always precipitated by his sinful nature (except in the case of his mother, in which instance he is expelled because of hers).

Curiously, he meets his mother during *Semana Santa*, a period that is symbolic of man's capacity for regeneration. Ironically, Guzmán's life here repeats its well-worn pattern. His mother again rejects him, an act that precipitates his descent into *el hampa* and eventual penal servitude. This is reminiscent of the opening chapters, when Guzmán by necessity becomes a *pícaro* in Madrid.

Guzmán makes several references to the sinful nature of man:

> somos de mala naturaleza (p. 797).
>
> que yo soy hijo de Eva y, metido en un paraíso de conservas, podríame tentar la serpiente de la carne (p. 427).
>
> viendo que todos somos hombres y que todos pecamos en Adán (p. 749).

He considers the corrupt state of the world to be a direct consequence of man's original sin:

> Porque como después de la caída de nuestros primeros padres, con aquella levadura se acedó toda la masa corrompida de los vicios, vino en tal ruina la fábrica deste reloj humano, que no le quedó rueca con rueca ni muelle fijo que las moviese. Quedó tan desbaratado, sin algún orden o concierto, como si fuera otro contrario en ser muy diferente del primero en que Dios lo crió, lo cual nació de la inobedencia sola (p. 824).

As Angel San Miguel has discussed, Alemán appears to be indicating that man's original "inobedencia" was carnal love.[16] In the San Juan de Alfarache scene, the Guzmán-Gracia and don Luis parallels, the central sin is lust. Guzmán reprehends his mother more than his father for succumbing to the temptations of the flesh. Even when he meets his mother again in Seville, he makes reference to her "famosas obras" (p. 850). Guzmán does blame himself for prostituting his wife, but when she leaves him, he says, "fuera de la obligación de consentirla, estaba libre del pecado cotidiano" (p. 835). The sins of the wife become the sins of the husband, as Eve's sin became Adam's, and the sins of the mother condemn the son, just as Eve's sin condemned mankind.

Several comparisons of Guzmán to Jonah, a variation of the theme of sin and expulsion, appear in the work. Like Guzmán, Jonah is a sinner who holds an embittered attitude toward society. There is a curious parallel between the Biblical story of Jonah and that of Guzmán. Jonah is ordered by the Lord to preach to the people of Nineveh; instead, he flees by ship to Tarshish. God's wrath takes the form of a storm and Jonah is thrown overboard as appeasement. In the *Guzmán*, the protagonist and Sayavedra, his cohort, play a trick on Guzman's relatives in Genoa and flee to Spain by ship. During a storm Sayavedra, driven to

madness, cries out, "¡Yo soy la sombra de Guzmán de Alfarache! ¡Su sombra soy yo, que voy por el mundo!" (p. 711), and then throws himself overboard. If we put aside the relationship that this character has with the author of the apocryphal version, it could be argued that Alemán transfers divine punishment to Guzmán's partner in crime, instead of eliminating his main character prematurely. Immediately before Sayavedra's death, Guzmán admits, "yo era el Jonás de aquella tormenta." (p. 710) Symbolically, Guzmán is punished through a surrogate figure's ("la sombra de Guzmán de Alfarache") death. Guzmán's reaction, "Signifiqué sentirlo, mas sabe Dios la verdad" (p. 711), seems monstrous when one considers that he is actually conscious of the fact that Sayavedra has died in his place. Like Jonah, Guzmán is given a second chance; he eventually repents on an intellectual level, but does not essentially change.

Guzmán also recalls Christ in some respects. His birth and second marriage parallel the Nativity narratives of the New Testament. Carroll B. Johnson has discussed the similarities between Christ's Passion and Guzmán's initial and final abandonments of Seville.[17] Guzmán's conduct certainly bears no resemblance to Christ's. However, in Christian terms Christ is viewed as the "last Adam" (I Corinthians 15:45). Christian man is a combination of the two Adams; he is sinful, as Adam was, yet through Christ he can reach perfection. The old Adam and the new Adam reflect the dichotomy in man's (and, in particular, Guzmán's) existence. Christ and Adam symbolize Guzmán's bivalent nature on one hand, and on the other, the innocence and perfection for which he longs.

The idea of Paradise, along with its Christian implications of the Fall of Man and original sin, is of central importance in this novel. Paradise in *Guzmán de Alfarache* is illusory; Guzmán never reaches a "sacred place" where he can abstain from making choices between good and evil and become dependent on some God-like (or mother or father-like) figure. The pattern of expulsions demonstrates that man cannot find Paradise on earth because of his sinful nature. The juxtaposition of the Creation and Nativity stories, and the Passion parallel suggest that man can regain lost innocence through Christ, the last Adam. Alemán shows that a mere intellectual acceptance of these principles does little to alleviate the burden of sin. Ultimately Guzmán repents, but the permanence or validity of this repentance is open to question; he condemns his past actions but takes great pleasure in recounting them. Whether Guzmán will ever reach any form of Paradise is not clear, but it can be concluded that a return to Paradise on earth is impossible.

The protagonist cannot be considered an allegorical Adam, Jonah or Christ because we see only fragments of these Biblical characters in him. Nonetheless, he resembles an allegorical figure in a secular sense by typifying Spain's plight in the world. Unlike northern European countries whose eyes were pragmatically set upon a future of prosperous mercantilism, Spain was intent on the organization of a theocratic "Paradise,"

a nationalistic version of the New Jerusalem, which was conceived of as the Church triumphant after the conversion of the Jews. Spain had, in effect, set herself on a nostalgic course; she wanted to create a society free of heresy, a sort of Christian utopia. Like Guzmán, society officially adhered to the teaching of Christ, but in practice made a mockery of them. Both were to discover that a course headed back in time, toward lost innocence and Paradise, was doomed to failure.

N. J. Rattey
University of California, Los Angeles

NOTES

1. A. Bartlett Giamatti, *The Earthly Paradise and the Renaissance Epic* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966), p. 3.

2. Mircea Eliade, *Images and Symbols* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969) Cited passages followed by page numbers will come from this edition.

3. See Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1958), p. 383 and *Myths, Dreams and Mysteries.* (London: Harvill, 1960), pp. 59–72. Eliade explains that according to almost all primitive mythologies, Heaven and Earth were in very close proximity to each other in primordial time. They were linked by means of a mountain, a tree or a ladder which man could climb in order to communicate with God. Eventually a separation occurred and man's paradisiac state came to an end. According to Mesopotamian tradition, man was created at the navel of the earth, a point at which there was a link between Heaven and Earth, hence the association with absolute reality, sacred power and immortality. Syrian and Jewish traditions tell us that Adam was created and buried at the center of the earth, Golgotha, where Christ was crucified.

4. Carl Jung considers man's longing for Paradise to be an unconscious archetype related to the mother archetype and the longing for redemption. He names Paradise, the kingdom of God and the Heavenly Jerusalem as symbols of the mother, as well as the Church, the university and places associated with fertility, such as the garden. See C. G. Jung, *The Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968)

5. Joseph E. Duncan, *Milton's Earthly Paradise* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1972), p. 100. See also J. M. Evans, *Paradise Lost and the Genesis Tradition* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968)

6. See Arnold Williams, *The Common Expositor An Account of the Commentaries on Genesis 1527–1633* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1948)

7. This work was reprinted several times—Cologne: 1601, Lyon: 1607, Lyon: 1610, Cologne: 1612, Cologne: 1685.

8. The work was never published in Spain.

9. Mateo Alemán, *Guzmán de Alfarache La novela picaresca española,* Edición, introducción y notas de Francisco Rico (Barcelona: Editorial Planeta, 1967), p. 129. All cited passages come from this edition.

10. Alexander A. Parker, *Literature and the Delinquent* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1967), p. 40.

11. Carroll B. Johnson discusses the analogy between judges and God in *Inside Guzmán de Alfarache* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1978), p. 219.

12. Joseph Ricapito, "From Boccaccio to Mateo Aleman: An Essay on Literary Sources and Adaptations" *Romanic Review,* 60 (1969), p. 89.

13. Ricapito, p. 90.

14. Alemán is not the first in Spanish literature to reinterpret the function of the garden. The garden in Fernando de Rojas' *La Celestina* is obviously not a classic *locus amoenus*.

15. Donald McGrady sees the novellette more in terms of a Baroque rejection of Renaissance idealizations. See his study, *Mateo Alemán* (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1968), pp. 147–157.

16. See Angel San Miguel, *Sentido y estructura del "Guzmán de Alfarache" de Mateo Alemán* (Madrid: Gredos, 1971), p. 57.

17. Johnson, pp. 154–156.

The idea initially surfaced in a *Mester* Editorial Board meeting and sprung to the top of the brew like the scurrying and scampering of an insignificant and orphaned bubble in a boiling caldron: an interview with three emeritus Professors of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese. Unlike many of the previous well-bred ideas tossed back and forth *ad infinitum* behind closed doors in such meetings, this one, of dubious parentage and character, had a humble and nobel taint. Its acceptance was resounding not in overwhelming bursts of glee and delight but rather in subtle (almost indecipherable) gestures of approval. What significance, a question thought and not spoken, would such an endeavor have in relation to the meaning of a "scholarly" Graduate Student Literary Journal which up to the moment had veered on so many occasions towards many dry and insipid dissections of literature? A phenomenon seldom understood, so authors tell us, after such dissections.

The question, further pondered and queried without the necessary analytical tools of the literary scholar, led me (as though seeking the sonnet to which my memory only grasped but the last couplet) to the original precept that motivated a young group of Graduate Students in 1970 to formalize the journal in the first place. The underlined current or principle leading to the conception and henceforth existence of *Mester*, and not to paraphrase, was to "establecer un vínculo de comunicación entre 'nosostros' y 'ustedes'". That was, still is and hopefully will be the "idea esencial" flirting with every page, indeed every word, of *Mester*.

It is the hope of the Editorial Board to uncover in this issue, even if only to a modest degree, the germ which ultimately led to the publication of *Mester* by presenting these interviews. Directly or indirectly, the three professors interviewed here, John Armstrong Crow, John Eugene Englekirk, and Donald F. Fogelquist have in their own way awakened the curiosity of the original founders of our journal as even now, in the same fashion, they direct doctoral dissertations of graduate students and give guidance to the same from within and also from outside the ranks of the current Editorial Board.

The order of presentation is as arbitrary as the alphabet, that is, we opted for a conventional order: Crow-Englekirk-Fogelquist. All three of the professors have published extensively in journals throughout their careers and all have primarily, although by no means exclusively, dealt with Latin American Literature and Culture. Professor Crow, for example, has published such works as *California as a Place to Live* (1956), *Mexico Today* (1957) (selected Book of the Year), *Spain: the Root and the Flower; a History of the Civilization of the Spanish People* (1963), *Greece: the Magic Spring* (1970) and *The Epic of Latin America* (1946), awarded the *Gold Medal Award* by *Look* magazine, recipient of the *Best Book of the Year Award by a California Author* by the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco and was also considered one of the best books of the year by the American Librarian Association. Also to his credit one finds extensive works on two Hispanic authors: *Federico García Lorca* (1945), and *Horacio Quiroga 1879-1937: sus mejores cuentos, introducción, selección y notas* (1943). This list is not complete; we have omitted other works, anthologies, readers and texts for the student of Spanish.

Professor Englekirk has perhaps published most extensively in journals dealing with Latin American Literature and Culture. In 1946 he published a *Bibliografía de obras norteamericanas en traducción española* followed by such works as *La literatura y la revista literaria en Hispanoamérica* (1961-1963), *De lo nuestro a lo ajeno* (1965), *La narrativa uruguaya: estudios y crítica bibliográfica* (1967), *An Anthology of Spanish American Literature* (1968) in collaboration with professor Crow, and perhaps a predilectable work of his, *Edgar Allan Poe in Hispanic Literature* (1972).

Many of professor Fogelquist's works deal with poetry, not exclusively Latin American poetry, as demonstrated by the following title: *Españoles de América y Americanos de España* (1968). The link between Spain and Latin America is more evident upon glancing at the following: *Rubén Darío: The Literary Collaboration and Personal Correspondence of Rubén Darío and Juan Ramón Jiménez*. Much of his attention has been devoted to the Modernist movement as seen in such works as *Lincoln in Martí, a Cuban View of Abraham Lincoln* translated by professor Fogelquist and *Rubén Darío: el símbolo excelso de las letras*. In 1958 he published *Juan Ramón Jiménez 1881-1959; vida y obra, bibliografía, antología*, a work later to find further attention in a publication dealing with the poetry and life of his close friend, *Juan Ramón Jiménez* (1976).

Although far from formal and perhaps less structured than the reader would prefer, as one will undoubtedly come to recognize, the interviews shed a *claroscuro* perspective on the three men. There are differences, but the degree of difference is certainly superceded by other factors that bind them together. Their warmth, their "humanness"—non-verbal communicative aspects not easily portrayed—, are strong tangent points they share. Under the spell of these wizards many of us hauled in a bounty which life itself cannot deplete. Ultimately words underwent an incredible metamorphosis—into life, and is not literature that which palpitates and breaths between the covers of books?

Onofre di Stefano
Westwood

Conversations with Three Emeritus Professors from UCLA: John A. Crow, John E. Englekirk, Donald F. Fogelquist

by Onofre di Stefano and Darlene Lorenz

John A. Crow

MESTER: After talking to Professor Englekirk and Professor Fogelquist, they both have said that they became interested in Spanish American literature by way of French and learning the French language. Is this the same in your case or did you come to this field in a different way?

CROW: Completely different. I was living in Dallas, Texas at the time my interest was aroused, and there are quite a few people of Mexican extraction who live in that area. The sounds of Spanish when I was just a kid about nine or ten years old—the beautiful sound of it—intrigued me and in high school I came to know some people from Mexico and some from South America, particularly Ecuador. So I started Spanish in high school and was spurred on by these people with their native pronunciation. The teacher's pronunciation was never quite as good as the natives and my ideal was to emulate the natives. So that's the way I really got started.

MESTER: Did you do your undergraduate work in Texas?

CROW: No, I went to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. It was a rather small university at that time but it had a good rating and was an inexpensive town to live in, a beautiful area with a fine climate. I was born in that state so I decided to go back there attending the University of North Carolina for 4 years. Then I went to New York to teach at New York University. When I was there I started at Columbia and got my M.A. Actually, I took all of the courses for the Ph.D. program too, but decided to go to Europe to finish the degree so I had to take courses for another year and a half, during which time I was writing the thesis. I finished the doctorate program at the University of Madrid.

MESTER: This was a Ph.D. in Spanish Literature?

CROW: Yes, it didn't have anything to do with Latin America at all, although at Columbia where I took the M.A. I studied for 4 years taking a lot of courses in Latin American literature. This was the field that

fascinated Ruíz, one of my professors, and through his intervention I went to Madrid, enrolled at the University there and some of his friends were willing to serve on my doctoral committee: Menéndez Pidal, Dámaso Alonso, González Valencia.

MESTER: Your dissertation was on what topic?

CROW: It was on Spain as seen by the English Romantics ("España vista por los románticos ingleses") and while most of the reading was done in English, the writing had to be in Spanish, of course. The main purpose of the thesis was to show what the English Romantics had said about Spain, some of them writing in prose and some in poetry, and how the concept in England, and in America too (in English and North American Literature), gradually changed from about 1750-1850. You could see the progression from Spain as a very backward, ugly, almost primitive country to a romantic, beautiful, perfect Spain. A lot of the Romantics, like Lord Byron and Shelley, and in particular Robert Southey, a figure who is forgotten now but who was well trained in Spanish and Portuguese literature, translated works from Spanish and wrote poems about Spain.

MESTER: You were in Spain during the 30's. Was that your first contact with the Spanish culture?

CROW: No, I had been there before, when Primo Rivera was dictator in 1928, I believe, but this was the first time I had lived there for any period of time, almost 2 years.

MESTER: Did you have any opportunity to meet any poets or writers during your second stay there?

CROW: Yes, I met Antonio Machado—I don't remember much of him —García Lorca and Pedro Salinas, who was one of my teachers at the University. He was the one that I probably got to know the best at that time. I had known García Lorca previously in New York when he was there three or four years before. I don't remember the exact date but he spent almost a year in New York. He lived near the Columbia University campus in one of the dormitories on the same floor I was on. So I had known him prior to this time, but I didn't see much of him when I was studying for my doctorate.

MESTER: What were your inpressions of García Lorca as a Spaniard in New York?

CROW: He was very much out of his element. He didn't know any English at all. He was constantly on the go, day and night, always playing someplace. He played the piano and the guitar, both beautifully. He toured colleges all over the area giving lectures, reading some of his poems which came from *Romancero gitano*. As a matter of fact he used to annoy me. I didn't realize at the time that he would be such a major figure. García Lorca was somewhat stuck on himself in the first place! He always talked about how great he was, which rubbed us the wrong

way. The thing that bothered us most was that he'd come by our rooms saying, *"Vi la luz encendida."* He would knock on the door at about 2:00 in the morning when we were just getting ready for the next day's classes, and he would come sit down for a couple of hours until we were exhausted!

MESTER: How long was he there?

CROW: Almost a year. And since he didn't have anything else to do, we had become good friends. (I shouldn't put it that way.) Occupied with other activities most of the time, on the weekends we had little to do, so we would spend hours together walking around to one place or another in the city. He loved to go to the cabarets, particularly where they played jazz at night. He was fascinated by jazz and modern Negro musicians. At that time, he had never heard any Negro spiritual singing at all. I think my roommate and I were the first to introduce it to him. Later, he became fascinated by it and almost an expert in Negro spiritual music.

MESTER: Did you ever keep in touch with him after New York?

CROW: No, not really. I kind of lost track of him.

MESTER: Did you begin teaching after that?

CROW: I was teaching at New York University while I was studying at Columbia. I took a leave of absence to go over to the University of Madrid. When I came back I continued at New York University on Washington Square, Washington City College they called it then, until 1937. At that time I came to UCLA and have been here ever since.

MESTER: Were there any programs in the United States at that time which focused on Latin American literature? Or was there a tendency to concentrate on Spanish literature?

CROW: At that time, the main focus was on Spanish literature and I imagine probably at Columbia University there were more courses offered in the Latin American field than anywhere else. It was primarily through Federico (Onís); he brought some of his friends from Mexico and Venezuela to teach, but he was the main one who gave these courses in Spanish Amerian literature. And when I was there, as a matter of fact, he invited Gabriela Mistral. She taught courses at Barnard College for women. I had a course with her at Barnard College. I don't remember the date, but she was there for one semester. Prior to that time, in 1922 I believe, her poems were not gathered together. She hadn't published a volume, just some scattered poems here and there. Onís read them and was one of the very first who said, "Here is a great talent." He invited her to come to New York. He published her first book, which was *Desolación*, under the Instituto de los Hispanos at Columbia University.

MESTER: Why was it do you think that it took so long for the interest in Spanish American literature to develop in the American university?

CROW: There are two reasons. One, our unversity system was oriented towards Europe, because of the Romance language degree. That was the one they offered primarily in those days. If you wanted to get a doctorate, it had to be in a Romance Language. You majored in Spanish, but you also had to take classes in French and Italian. There may have been exceptions, I'm not sure. So actually they concentrated on Spanish literature and the teachers were trained primarily in that area. The other reason was, and this was a strong one, Spanish American literature was not as good then. It had achieved quite a bit of stature in poetry but I can think back on some of the novels I read from the 19th Century and I'd hate to have to assign any of those. They're just not any good. It's not until the last 20 years that the prose writers came to the fore. They are writing novels and short stories now as good as any. But this was not true in the 1920's or 30's.

MESTER: The emphasis recently has been placed on the Spanish American contemporary novel. Do you find this novel at par with the production of other countries?

CROW: Yes. Some of the writers in Spanish America as well as in Brazil are the equals of writers in any other country—Carlos Fuentes, García Márquez and quite a few others. In the short story, you have Cortázar, for example.

MESTER: Do you see a new generation of writers beginning to publish or has the crest already been attained in Latin America in terms of the novel?

CROW: Most things tend to go in cycles, but I wouldn't dare to try to foresee the future by saying it's already crested. It is at its crest for the present time because people like Fuentes and even Cortázar are young and they might still in the future write their best work. Yáñez is rather old, but others are still young and may surprise themselves. I don't know of any young writers in their 20's or 30's who I would say are equal to the older hands as yet.

MESTER: Do you have a favorite novel?

CROW: No, I don't. It's like someone asking what's your favorite grand opera. The only sensible answer would be that it's constantly changing. It depends on what mood you are in, what age you are and how the performance happens to be. Reading novels is the same way. It depends a lot on your frame of mind and what you happen to be interested in at that particular moment.

MESTER: Many critics have said that there is a close relationship between Faulkner and such Latin American writers as Juan Rulfo, especially in *Pedro Páramo*. Do you see such a relationship?

CROW: In general they are kindred spirits; I don't see any actual influence. I don't believe anyone was trying to imitate Faulkner, but he is certainly the most widely read North American novelist; and probably

the most widely read foreign novelist by people writing in Latin America at the present time. I don't know exactly what the reason is. Carlos Fuentes has given a reason which may be a valid one. He looks on Faulkner as being "a novelist of defeat," seeing society in a kind of crucial situation, almost at the point of crucifixion. This appeals greatly to the Latin Americans who feel that their own society has reached a similar crucial crossroad. There is a certain disintegration at the same time as forward movement goes on. Those two things interwoven in Faulkner is what, I believe, appeals to them most. Also, his style. Occasionally he comes out with brilliant flashes of poetry. And all Latin American writers use beautiful images. A person begins to search for them as he is reading. In any of the novels I am always waiting for the next beautiful image, metaphor or simile to come out. One who is particularly gifted in that regard is Alejo Carpentier.

MESTER: Would you say that the novelist abuses these images in order to reach the reader?

CROW: It wouldn't be so for my own sensibility, but each person has his own tastes. I don't think anyone would say Theodore Dreiser has any poetry in his works and yet he's regarded as a great North American writer. But my own sensibility is always looking for these poetic flashes which are intuitive insights into the psyche. This is what pleases me personally.

MESTER: In your classes, do you feel that your students can be taught the difference between a good piece of literature and one that may not be worthwhile to read? Is this something that one can teach a student?

CROW: I don't know if you can teach those things, but what we can do is give the person an opportunity to come into contact with them and usually they will get to like the best and get to make the judgment as to what is good and what is bad on their own. Most all human beings have their own sharp sensibilities in regard to the expression of the world and the insight into human personality. While they all might not like the same kinds of writing, they will get to the point where they appreciate what is well done and they will know, on the contrary, what is not well written.

MESTER: Have you detected any change in students from when you started teaching here in 1937 as compared to 1979?

CROW: Yes, you detect some very specific things, although not terribly important. Most of them are on the surface, but I'll mention the unimportant things first. In the earlier years, students could write better English on the whole than they can now. The high schools might have been more rigorous. They didn't have difficulty in expressing themselves dramatically, that is, clearly. Now sometimes I find that even among graduate students, especially the beginning graduate students, a kind of verbosity and floundering and lack of organization, on the one hand,

and, on the other, spelling has become abominable. Nobody spells words properly now. As a teacher, I must say these things are rather unimportant, but most students have gotten in the habit of spelling something wrong and they don't bother to look it up. Teachers make the corrections, but the student should go to the dictionary. I look up plenty of words myself. Insofar as sensitivity is concerned, it is just as sharp as it ever has been, maybe sharper now than ever before. But the matter of organization, and putting things into clear focus is probably not quite as good as it was 20 or 30 years ago. The role of the teachers is to help students improve this.

MESTER: Looking back over the years spent here at UCLA, can you think of one year or event, that has special meaning to you?

CROW: No, I can't frankly. All the years seem the same, they were all good years. Some people look forward to authors coming and speaking. That to me was like having a piece of cake after a good meal, but it never seemed terribly important one way or another. Frankly, I've never heard an author come and give a good talk. Usually, the best is in their works. They begin to flounder when they do their own interpretation. It usually is not on target. They say what they think people want to hear.

John E. Englekirk

MESTER: Professor Englekirk, where have you taught?

ENGLEKIRK: New York City, the northwest Chicago area, New Mexico (ten years), New Orleans.

MESTER: Albuqueque?

ENGLEKIRK: Yes, from 1928–1939, at the University. Then twenty years at Tulane University, 1939 to 1958. Now I'm at UCLA.

MESTER: Was there any particular incident that prompted you to undertake this career?

ENGLEKIRK: I knew that I didn't want to do anything else but go into college. If I had to teach, teach. I always liked to teach. I used to teach my younger brother, tell stories. I wouldn't do anything else.

MESTER: Where did you do your undergraduate studies?

ENGLEKIRK: At Bard College; it used to be St. Stephens College. It was a neighborhood college. We lived about a hundred miles up the Hudson. It was near Vassar. It was strictly a male institution at that time. It became co-educational much later. It was good then, one of the really good experimental co-educational institutions. Since we lived about fifteen miles away I used to commute. I belonged to a fraternity, Sigma Alpha Epsilon, and things like that, so I liked what there was in college life. There was pressure to go into agriculture at Cornell, to go to a law

school in Albany, or into banking. One day my French professor came along and said "How would you like to teach French at Northwestern University?" And I said, "Yes, how do I do it?" Of course he had gotten a teaching assistantship for two top flight young people. So I went there to teach French. I had no Spanish whatsoever.

MESTER: At Northwestern?

ENGLEKIRK: I went to Northwestern as a TA in French. But sometime before that I knew I wanted Spanish. And I had taken the only Spanish that I had as an undergraduate with an Italian. His Spanish was abominable, as Spanish can be when it's spoken by an Italian. So when we would get into class, I still remember he would stand up and say "OK, why don't you say 'le lo' and instead say 'se lo'?" Then he'd look over to Englekirk and say "I'm going to let Jack answer." I had taken Latin and Greek, that kind of linguistic approach, so I'd explain it, and there would be a sigh of relief after that. There was no second year but because of the TA-ship I was given a second year to get two years on the record. He'd say, "Read *Doña Perfecta*. Come in and we'll talk about *Doña Perfecta*." So I'd go in in the morning and talk about *Doña Perfecta* but not until he'd had a cup of tea, and a biscuit or something. Since I had four years of French in high school—obviously I would accept a TA-ship in French. But I knew that as soon as I got to Northwestern I was going to take Spanish; I knew I'd like to teach Spanish. But were they going to let me take it, having had these two brilliant years at St. Stephens, and taking Spanish at Northwestern?

MESTER: Was *Doña Perfecta* your initiation to Spanish literature?

ENGLEKIRK: In a way. I don't suppose we had a book on Spanish American literature in those days. At Northwestern there was not a single course given on Spanish American literature from 1926 to 1928. One of Costa Rica's distinguished philologists and poets and a philosopher had just come in from Cornell to Northwestern, so that was a blessing. So I took Spanish philology—a required course there—but no courses in literature were given. So even though the professor was a poet, he didn't give courses in literature. He knew Spanish-American literature and had met Darío. In those days contemporary Spanish-American literature meant Darío and the Modernist group. It was only 1926–1928, when most of them (the Modernists) were still alive. I can still remember when finally we decided on my M.A. thesis, he said, "You know, we have a whole load of books—dumped in the basement library". I got permission, and went down to this dark, damp basement, and there they were, just shovelled up high. Books that nobody had the time or the money to catalogue. I spent many hours—it was my first introduction to feeling Spanish American books. (laugh) So I never took a course in Latin American literature, but I did my thesis on Latin American literature. That's when I began my work on Poe; I think I called it "Notes on Poe in Spanish-American Literature." That's being nutty, isn't

it, to do a work on the influence of Poe, when there weren't any Spanish American books around? The one good place in Chicago was the Newberry Library. The Chicago Public Library was pretty good because there was quite a large Spanish speaking population in that area. And there were books in Spanish, a good many of them dealing with Spanish-

MESTER: Were there any universities in the United States that were offering Latin American literature at that time?

ENGLEKIRK: I don't remember now whether it was offered at Chicago, but I think not. When I went there to visit there were really no Latin American specialists there. There were very few anywhere. Stanford was giving a course, Arizona was giving a course, Harvard was giving a course, I know, because the professor who directed my M.A. thesis was completing his doctorate at Harvard. I choose a topic in Latin American literature because of my interest in the field. He was working on Modernism and one of the things that bothered him was the phrase in his famous literary history of Latin America to the effect that Poe and Whitman were greatly admired and exerted considerable influence on Latin American literature. Wouldn't you like to take a nice little topic like that, Poe in Latin American literature? I knew you'd have to be mad to do something like that. At the same time there was a professor who became one of the world's foremost Poe scholars teaching at Northwestern. I went to see him and we became close friends. And I said, "What do you mean 'Spanish American' literature? Is there such a thing?" And it worked out all right. That's when I finally decided to go to Columbia for the Ph.D. Del Río was coming up from Florida; Onís had just come over from Spain and was just beginning to systematize the offerings and introduce Latin American literature into the program.

MESTER: Was that about the time that he (Onís) was putting together the anthology?

ENGLEKIRK: Well, yes. I was sitting in one of his classes, "Hombres grandes de América Latina." What he used to do was bring in the manuscipts he happened to be working on and he'd read the poems that he thought should be included in the anthology. And when he'd give a lecture, he was testing a critical approach and his appreciation of these poets. So there was a whole generation of students listening to these classes. Columbia was one of the big centers for Hispanic Studies. So, yes, the answer is that I saw the manuscript in the various stages of its development.

MESTER: When did you start teaching here at UCLA?

ENGLEKIRK: In 1958.

MESTER: Who are some of the interesting authors you have met?

ENGLEKIRK: Agustín Yañez, Octavio Paz, Borges; I met Rómulo Gallegos at the last meeting in Caracas. It was his last big stand, where

the Rómulo Gallegos novel prize was announced. Our next meeting is going to be dedicated to him: "Texto y contexto de la obra de Rómulo Gallegos." I got to know Gallegos very well. And some of the younger writers like Ernesto Villa Sánchez, Pacheco, and others. I met more authors in my earlier days, when I wanted to meet as many people as I could.

MESTER: Are there any particular novels you re-read occasionally?

ENGLEKIRK: I'm sure no one ever said that he'd like to read *Cien años de soledad* over, but I promised myself that I'd re-read it the first free moments I had to see if he (García Márquez) could lose me as easily as he did the first time and to enjoy the *"olvidado arte de novelar"* that he revives. I said to myself this is a book I have to read over again, as you read the *Quijote* over and over again. Or *Terra Nostra* by Carlos Fuentes, which is almost asking too much of the reader. These men really want you to live with them, and out-guess them. I'd rather just enjoy an author, and chuckle with him and leave it at that. Some authors abuse the reader.

MESTER: You mention the tendency of modern Latin American novelists to abuse the reader. They force the reader to construct and give form to the novel; many readers get lost between the pages. Why has this come to be true in the last twenty to twenty-five years?

ENGLEKIRK: One of the first ones to do that was Mariano Azuela. When asked why he wrote that way, he answered that he wanted to write something "a lo moderno."

MESTER: Do you feel that students' attitudes have adjusted toward Latin American literature "a lo moderno" since you started teaching?

ENGLEKIRK: Yes, there's been a great change. First of all, there are thousands of students interested in Latin American literature year after year. And I find them much better prepared than my generation, which came to Spanish through other languages—Latin, Greek, French, Italian, Most students today were either born with the language or have lived in a Spanish-speaking environment and have often had the opportunity to take a wider variety of courses. On the whole, students are much better prepared today and more dedicated.

MESTER: One last question. What do you foresee in the future for Latin American literature studies? Will it continue to grow? Will there be a decline?

ENGLEKIRK: Latin American Studies as part of the social sciences peaked out some time ago. With less government support and with less foundation support I think they will level off and only the best programs will continue. As far as the solidity of our program in Hispanic Literature and Linguistics—it is firmly entrenched now with the continuing importance of the whole Latin American set of nations. Spain and Portugal have gone through significant social changes. I think that we

have a good future ahead of us. Of course our own profession of teaching in the humanities has been hard hit. But its the same story all over, at UCLA and everywhere.

Donald F. Fogelquist

MESTER: Professor Fogelquist, are you a native of California?

FOGELQUIST: No, I've lived in California only since 1948. I consider myself a native of the state of Washington, but I've lived in many other parts of the country: Florida, Maryland, Wisconsin. I was born in Iowa, but I have no memory of it, having left there at a very tender age.

MESTER: When did you start teaching at UCLA?

FOGELQUIST: 1948

MESTER: What originally attracted you to Hispanic Literature?

FOGELQUIST: This is rather hard to pinpoint. My interest in this field goes back to adolescence; I'm not sure what started it. My first foreign language was French, and I liked that very much. Then when I got into Spanish, I really felt that I had discovered the field I wanted to be in.

MESTER: Did you read a lot of Spanish literature in your formative years or did that come later in college?

FOGELQUIST: I don't remember that I did. I had my first taste of literature in Spanish in college. I well remember the first novel I read, *María* by Jorge Isaacs.

MESTER: Looking back from your initiation to the present, have the rewards outweighed the sacrifices?

FOGELQUIST: Yes, definitely. I don't think there were any great sacrifices. Things probably worked out better than I deserved.

MESTER: I have a question about the students you've had. Are students motivated by a love for the arts or are material reasons involved?

FOGELQUIST: I think it's pretty hard to generalize. Most of my work has been done with graduate students in recent years and I think that they are generally motivated by their interest in the field and in the arts in general. It's not quite the same when you're speaking of an undergraduate. In that group, I suppose, there is a larger percentage of people who are more concerned with a means of living than anything else.

MESTER: Would you term a professor a critic of literature? And, how much room is there to establish a relationship with students?

FOGELQUIST: I suppose he is a critic of sorts, but my feeling has always been that the human relationship is the most important one. I could go on the subject at some length, but stating the thing briefly, I think that your relationship with your students as human beings is the most important thing. The subject matter itself you can soon forget or put aside;

it passes into oblivion. Perhaps some of the personal contacts that you make can be of some significance, lasting significance.

MESTER: Can literature be taught? What I mean is: can a student be taught to discern what "good" literature is or can he just be taught to be aware of "good" literature?

FOGELQUIST: Well, I suppose that he can be taught to some limited extent, but most of his appreciation of literature will be acquired through his own effort. A professor may make some statements that will serve to guide a student in some particular direction. Maybe he will have something worthwhile to offer. But I think that the student's own work and application is the most important thing.

MESTER: New trends in literature have developed in recent years. For instance, the emphasis now being put on Chicano literature in the university is much greater from what it was ten years ago. Is there a reason for the change? Is it because we have a different type of student in literature classes?

FOGELQUIST: Well, I think you have a different type in the sense that you have perhaps a larger percentage of minority groups, if "minority" is the right term. I'm not sure how much of an increase there has been in minorities. There have always been minorities in the university, but perhaps it's the awakening of the public in general to the existence of the minorities as a group in society that has just as much right to exist, just as much right to benefit from the advantages of education. These people have just as much right as anyone else, and I don't think this has been recognized until quite recently. And there's been some increase in the inducement to students from this segment of society to enter the university. There have been more inducements of various kinds, scholarships and whatnot, grants of various kinds—so there has been an increase through these menas. But it has come about by greater recognition on the part of the public of the existence of these people, and I say this existence in the sense that people are now aware of them and of their needs to a much greater extent than they were in the past.

MESTER: An unfair question to you: do you have a favorite poet that you have enjoyed throughout the years, is there one particular poet that stays in your mind, one that gives you a certain amount of joy lacking in others?

FOGELQUIST: I don't know that I could give you the name of just one single poet. I could give you the names of more than one that I could read repeatedly. One of them is Unamuno, another is Borges, and Vallejo, and of the older poets one of those I most admire of his generation is Enrique González Martínez. I can always read him with enjoyment. And of course I should mention Juan Ramón Jiménez.

MESTER: You mention Borges as one of your favorite poets. I had primarily thought of Borges as a short story writer and a person that had

cultivated the essay to the ultimate. Is he equally gifted as a poet and as a short story writer?

FOGELQUIST: I'm not at all sure I can give you the correct answer to that question. Borges is certainly better known for his prose, for his stories, than for his poetry. And quanitatively I suppose he excells as a short story writer, but I'm not sure he's superior as a prose writer. Rather I'd be inclined to think the other way.

MESTER: Arreola recently said that when Pablo Neruda died, the entire world lost "the best poet of the last three decades". Would you agree with him?

FOGELQUIST: Well, I'm not well acquainted with world literature in general to be able to make a statement that would have any validity on that subject. Neruda is a great poet, was a great poet, there is no question about it. He had a tremendous creative genius, creation of metaphors, just one after another in succession. If you read for instance "Machu Picchu" from his *Canto General*, it's just a succession of metaphors, one after the other, and not repetitious. These are original. He was a great poetic genius, no doubt. Whether he was the greatest poet of recent decades, I couldn't say. I think there are other poets more profound than Neruda.

MESTER: It's been said that poetry necessitates some sort of conflict: an inner conflict, a conflict between a man and a woman, for example. Would you agree with this idea of "conflict as an inherent element" of poetry? Perhaps tension might be a better word than conflict.

FOGELQUIST: Yes, I think that in the best poetry there is some conflict, and I wouldn't say that conflict over some such thing as a political ideology is the best source of poetry. I think any inner conflict is where the best poetry springs from.

MESTER: I recall hearing that Latin America stopped looking to Europe as a spiritual guide with the poetry of Rubén Darío. Since then, Latin America has been establishing its own trends in literature. I don't know if you would agree or disagree with that. Is there any trend that one can pinpoint in contemporary Latin American poetry?

FOGELQUIST: Not that I'm aware of. It seems to me that there is a great deal of protest in poetry, but aside from that I don't know that you could identify any particular trend. As to your statement about the liberation from European influences, I don't suppose that Latin America will ever be liberated from these influences, if liberation is the proper word to use.

MESTER: Would you say that there has been a reversal in many instances, let's say, a more direct influence by Latin American artists on European artists?

FOGELQUIST: There have been influences from Latin America on European art and literature. The one proof of it is that Diego Rivera was

brought to Italy to give his opinion and advice on the reconstruction of some works that had been destroyed during the war. Certainly Diego Rivera had a big influence abroad. And going farther back certainly Rubén Darío had a tremendous influence in Spain in particular. This reversed the tendencies that had always prevailed up to this time. In other words, the impulse came from Latin America rather than from Spain.

MESTER: You mentioned that perhaps one of the elements in poetry has been the "protest" factor. Do you feel that a poet is a critic, or are these two terms mutually exclusive?

FOGELQUIST: A critic of literature? A critic of society?

MESTER: A critic of society.

FOGELQUIST: Yes, I think poets always have been critics of society, and probably always will be. Now if you refer to critics of literature, I would say that the best critics of literature are poets. One case in point would be that of Octavio Paz.

MESTER: Who reads poetry in North and South America? Is it the same audience?

FOGELQUIST: Well, I'm not sure. I suppose that it is a minority in both cases. I suspect the audience is larger in Latin America than in the United States. People in the United States—I'm referring to the general public—seem to be afraid of poetry. I think it's too bad. They shouldn't be. Latin Americans are less so. I think the poet is generally more revered in Latin America than in the United States, although this is a broad generalization; I don't know how much it's worth.

MESTER: Has the appreciation of poetry diminished with the coming of television?

FOGELQUIST: I would say that the appreciation of literature in general has declined.

MESTER: Would you say that the quality of literature has also declined?

FOGELQUIST: I'm not sure that it has. It is very hard to make any kind of meaningful statement when you are speaking of such a tremendous field of culture. There is a lot of excellent writing at present, and there's a tremendous amount of trash. I'm sure the trash far outweighs the good literature.

MESTER: The question has been raised as to whether or not the United States is becoming more sensitive to humanistic values. Do you see such a trend today in the United States?

FOGELQUIST: The trends seem to have been away from humanistic values. Whether there will be a swing back I don't know. I'm not a prophet, or well enough informed about the many fields of culture to be

able to make a significant statement or prediction. I hope there will be a swing back.

MESTER: Do you think that there has been perhaps a tendency in the institutions of North America to belittle the arts at this point in history and concentrate more on the sciences?

FOGELQUIST: I don't know that "belittle" is the right term, but perhaps practical considerations outweigh all others, and that accounts for the way things are going.

MESTER: What is your perspective on the student? Is there an intangible benefit for the literature student?

FOGELQUIST: Well, I think that the main benefits that come from this type of study are probably intangible. I'm sure that many of our unemployed graduate students would support that idea. What is derived from this type of study does have a more direct bearing on one's relations with humanity in general than say a course in engineering. It should make you a more sympathetic and understanding human being than if you had simply taken a course in engineering. Not that I belittle the scientific courses, far from it. But that it is possible for a person to combine both things, to have the engineering skills, techniques, knowledge, and still have a broader humanistic view of humanity than would come normally from simply the study of engineering subjects, for example, is somewhat rare. An engineer may be just as sensitive and appreciative of the arts as anybody who has specialized in that field, but he is less likely, I think, to have this appreciation.

A Pesca*

Ao abrir os olhos, Manel deu com a clareza de lua que lhe feria as pálpebras, despertando-o. A luz enfiava-se em lâminas finas por entre as gretas no tecto de palha chamando-o daquele soninho profundo. Esfregou os olhos com o dorso do indicador e voltou o rosto para a mulher que dormia ainda ao seu lado. Pensou um momento no seu dever de pai de família; não hesitou mais em se levantar. Saltou para fora da esteira, enfiou as miúdas pernas no calção de mar, agarrou o saco de lona que continha o seu tesouro de pescador e tomou aquela marcha de todos os dias que já lhe era instintiva. Equilibrando-se por entre os filhos que atapetavam o chão sobre colchões de sarapilheira, o pescador dirigiu-se à única saída do funco.

A ausência do calor do seu homem, fez com que Bia acoradasse logo. Ela viu o vulto difuso distanciando-se para a saída e disse.

—Manel, panha um totoko na marmita, pelo meno pa bo mata jejum, home.

O homem acenou que não com a cabeça e, levantando a saca que servia de porta, por um instante, ficou gravado em relevo de silhueta negra num fundo azulão que o enquadrava. Um assobio furou a madrugada e a saca caiu com o gesto de um cair de pano no derradeiro acto.

Bia ouviu os passos raspantes na areia afastando-se em cadência rítmica costabaixo como um chocalho que penetrava nas entranhas da madrugada.

O compadre Toi esperava na esquina do funco quando Manel deu-lhe o bom dia. Toi tinha um vago aspecto de sentinela que resistia à invasão contínua da fome. Levava um chapéu de palha tosca sem aba, uma camisola que já nem se atrevia a comprometer a cor original e um calção que se vinha encurtando cada vez mais desde já alguns anos.

Os dois homens desceram a lomba íngreme em silêncio duplo.

Na praia, viam-se vultos difusos, atarefados, preparando-se para a faina quotidiana. Ouviam-se vozes e fragmentos de palavras no vento, comentando o último desastre da pequena aldeia. ". . . koitada di Tai . . . fika asim dezemparada ko pe cheu di fiyo . . . Eh! . . bida di mar e asim . . ."

Já perto da praia, Toi separou-se do compadre que tomava o caminho solitário para a outra banda da Ponta. Os pés curtidos já eram impermeáveis às pontas bicudas dos cascalhos e calhaus da beira mar. As

*José da Silva Gonçalves, natural de Cabo Verde, estudia en los Estados Unidos desde 1964. Antiguo estudiante en el Departamento de Español y Portugués en UCLA, recibió en 1974 su Bachillerato en Portugués y Español y, en 1976, la Maestría en Literaturas Románicas en la misma universidad. Actualmente es candidato al doctorado en Educación Comparada e Internacional en UCLA. Este cuento ganó el primer premio de prosa en el Simposio Luso-Americano de 1976.

espinhas dos arredores eram impotentes sob esses escudos esmagadores que as pisavam desde já muito tempo. Pelas gretas da roupa, a brisa fresca do mar entrava em carícias friazinhas no calor da madrugada. O pescador meteu a mão dentro da bolsa de lona que levava aos ombros e tirou aquela única herança que o pai deixou-lhe, ao fim da vida. Era um anzol americano que nos velhos tempos tinha servido ao pai com a força mágica de uma varinha de condão. Imediatamente, porém, Manel começou a pensar nas dívidas que tinha na loja do Beto de Baí e ressoavam-se-lhe de novo as duras palavras do comerciante quando, no fim do mês, o pescador compareceu com apenas algumas explicações, em vez do pagamento prometido. As palavras insultuosas caiam-lhe em cima como blocos imensos. O humilhado nem queria se lembrar daquele episódio, mas não pôde evitar os pensamentos perseguidores que lhe atormentavam desde aquele dia . . . "eu que nunca perdi o respeito de nenhum homem. Esses lojeiros de hoje que não sabem o que é um pão ganho à base de suor e sangue, eles que não conhecem um centavo honesto, insultam o pobre como se a pobreza fosse algum crime. Eu, pelo menos, orgulho-me de não conhecer a vergonha por ter feito manhas na época de balanço como tantos deles. Bem sabem que estes senhores lojistas que hoje se crêem dignos de respeitos e, por cima, com o direito de desflorarem as filhinhas dos seus fregueses pobres, começaram os seus estabelecimentos com balcões de caixas de bolachas colocadas umas em cima das outras . . . mas, esta terra não tem justiça para gente pobre. Eu os conheço muito bem. Se vou às suas lojas não é pelo respeito que merecem mas porque a vida de pobre parece ser de constante dependência daqueles vampiros que só sabem chupar o sangue do pobre. Sei muito bem como fizeram as suas fortunas: foi tudo à custa dos embarcadiços que chegavam à terra com dinheiro para gastar. Ainda se fosse só com eles que aumentavam as facturas não era nada, mas não, aproveitam de todos para se enriquecerem . . ." Escorregando neste instante numa pedra lisa, Manel voltou dos pensamentos que tanto lhe torturavam desde aquele dia na loja do Beto. No entanto, continuava a sua caminhada, equilibrando-se sobre aquelas enormes pedras que pareciam cercar o mar por alguma inspiração divina. O seu único desejo naquele instante era que aquele anzol lhe ajudasse tanto hoje como fez outrora para o pai. Agora só desejava uma boa pesca. Ele tinha confiança naquela arma por causa de um episódio que ouvira o pai contar quando ainda era um garotinho.

Parece que a família estava nas mesmas condições de penúrias mas o velho tinha grande esperança na riqueza do mar. Para ele a única possibilidade da terra estava no mar. Foi mesmo por isso que tinha abandonado a vida de agricultor quando as secas e as lestadas cíclicas destruiam toda a vegetação da terra. Já que não se podia depender da chuva e do clima para uma vida agrícola, o pai tinha resolvido ainda na sua juventude procurar a vida no mar que era muito mais seguro do que na terra. Pelo menos, no mar só se podia perder a vida tentando fazer a

vida. Ele sabia que a vida do mar era sempre um jogo, mas preferia arriscar a vida todos os dias no mar do que esperar impotentemente à chuva que não vinha ou a lestada que nunca deixava crescer as plantinhas mirradas. Isto em suma era a razão porque se tinha tornado pescador. Embora a vida do mar fosse dura ele sempre pensava na possibilidade de tirar melhor proveito do mar. Uma vez até chegou a sugerir ao administrador que fizesse um impréstimo aos pescadores com o objectivo de financiar um barquito à motor. O administrador, porém, ficou muito ralhado com um pescador ignorante que queria financiar um barco para a comunidade. Até achou graça que o pescador tivesse ideias socialistas em querer formar uma cooperativa. Foi a última vez que o pai de Manel solicitou qualquer ajuda dum oficial do governo. Ele tinha demasiado orgulho para ser humilhado perante seus colegas. Mas sempre repetia: "mar k'e rikeza di nos terra". Manel voltou a pensar naquela pesca que o pai fez e que outros pescadores da aldeia tiveram que ajudá-lo na faina. E foi com este mesmo anzol que pescou aquela tainha que até hoje os velhos comentam. Manel ainda era muito pequeno para se lembrar do episódio mas a estória ficou-lhe gravado na mente até hoje. Além disso só um anxol americano podia realizar tal proeza porque todos sabiam que as coisas americanas eram as melhores do mundo. Sim senhor, os mesmos embarcadiços que lá estiveram não se cansavam de fazer alardes das mil maravilhas daquele país onde dizem que Deus andou com os próprios pés.

Hoje também era o mesmo anzol. A única herança do seu pai. O velho coitado não acumulou mais fortuna do que este pequeno sinal-de-amizade que o compadre Jack tinha trazido na sua última viagem da América. Agora tinha a mesma esperança nesta arma que teria que resolver todas as suas dificuldades. Uma pesca, uma boa pesca era só o que agora queria. O anzol que trazia dentro do punho agora misturava-se com o suor da mão curtida. O homem de Bia dava voltas e reviravoltas àquela vara de condão em que tanta esperança tinha.

Aquela madrugada era especial. Não apenas porque o vento da beira mar cortava um pouco mais do comum mas porque o mar parecia conter mais água e parecia ser muito mais profundo. Ele, pescador veterano que julgava conhecer o mar melhor do que a terra, hoje sentia um certo receio desse mundo de águas que abafava-lhe a alma toda. Um sentimento de insignificância apoderou-se dele e sentiu um calafrio correr-lhe costas abaixo até os joelhos que se lhe dobravam elasticamente sob o corpo.

Chegou ao lugar que lhe parecia mais prometedor e ali poisou o sebento saco de lona que cheirava ao único perfume que ele jamais conheceu. Tirou o resto da isca que não fora usada no dia anterior e, com os dentes, picou, em fatias, as sardinhas já em princípio de decomposição e com um cuidado cirúrgico, enfiou-as no anzol com a esperança de uma criança que preparara o papagaio para lancá-lo ao vento.

Quando Manel lançou a linha para o mais longe que aqueles poucos

metros alcançavam, começaram a aparecer os primeiros raios de sol. Até então não se podia ver o mar com muita nitidez, apenas se podia pressentir a sua divina omnipresença; a sua força e os seus sons indiscutíveis. A cadência das ondas batendo nas pedras, algumas salpicaduras no rosto e a brisa húmida eram os indícios daquele imenso mundo horizontal.

Depois de algum tempo de subir e baixar a linha para criar a impressão de que o troço inerte que pendurava do anzol era algum bicho desprotegido, Manel sentou-se em cima duma pedra chã para descansar. Maquinalmente, repetia a mesma acção da linha sem nenhum resultado. As pálpebras começaram a baixarem-se-lhe pouco a pouco do sono que jamais conseguira terminar. O corpo chumbou-se-lhe até que se esqueceu por completo do lugar onde estava. A imagem veio brumosamente no princípio formando um mundo cheio de coisas estranhas que ele jamais tinha visto. Eram edifícios altíssimos, ruas muito largas e cheias de gente transitanto para baixo e para cima, carros de todos os tamanhos e feitios, fumo de fábricas, jardins com flores raras. Tudo isto parecia-lhe coisas que tinha visto em algumas revistas que chegavam do estrangeiro. No meio de tudo surgiu um homem conhecido, muito conhecido. Incrível mesmo, mas era, efectivamente era ele, Ele! ELE?

Subitamente, a vara dobrou-se da ponta ao cabo. A linha cortava a água numa cadência louca de pêndulo: ora dum lado ora do outro. Tinha mesmo a impressão que voava um papagaio salvo que o peso que sentia no ponta da linha era muito longe dos leves papagaios que voava quando criança. Sentia que era um peixe muito grande pela força que fazia para se libertar do ferro que lhe espetava as guerlas. Mas Manel segurava a vara esperançosamente. Eram duas forças, dois mundos lutando um contra o outro. O peixe desesperando por se libertar, o pescador aferrando-se mais para arrancá-lo das entranhas do mar. Essa força que não queria ceder, parecia possuir toda a energia do mar. Manel, contudo, considerava todo o esforço do seu adversário em vão porque ele, o pescador, era quem mais precisava ganhar aquele combate. Depois de algum tempo de disputa, o homem começou a sentir-se abatido. Já cansado pela luta contra o peixe, entrou-lhe o medo de perder aquele prémio. Mas ficou mais animado quando sentia o bicho acalmando-se na ponta da linha.

O sol já ia muito alto. Agora havia menos movimento na linha e Manel pensava que em qualquer momento o peixe ia ceder de cansaço. Apenas esperava o momento de verdade quando podia içar aquela pesca com que tanto sonhara. Naquele instante queria ter um arpão. Só um arpão podia resolver aquela concorrência por tanto tempo disputada. O marido de Bia podia ver a sombra prateada do peixe que dardejava, ora subindo, ora descendo aos pontos mais profundos até desaparecer-lhe da vista. Manel levantou os olhos para ver a hora do dia. Pela inclinação do sol sabia que já passava do meio-dia.

De súbito, porém, recomeçou a resistência. Agora a luta era mais

forte do que nunca. O peixe desenfreado, puxava raivosamente daquí e dacolá. O bambú, única arma do pescador, dobrava como uma varinha verde açoitada pelo vento. Para o marido de Bia, contudo, não havia outra alternativa do que o domínio do peixe, custe o que custar. Agora, pela primeira vez desde o começo da luta, o peixe começava a fuga para o mar fora. A vara brandia até tocar com a ponta na água. De repente o bicho acalmou-se. O pescador não sentia mais do que um peso morto no ponta da linha. Convencido de que o peixe já devia estar esgotado, um sorriso verteu-se-lhe do rosto. Inesperadamente, a vara contraiu-se ao máximo, formado arco, o anzol cortou as águas com a raiva duma flecha e subiu para o céu. Ao ver o seu sonho destruído, o pescador fez uma careta irónica, maravilhado pelo facto de que o peixe não subisse também para o céu. Já fora de si, o homen deu um berro, blasfemando as esperanças e sonhos enganosos. Tudo isto passara num instante de choque mas que parecia uma eternidade. E, o anxol que outrora tinha sido a esperança da família, desceu com a velocidade de um raio e cravou-se-lhe na língua.

José da Silva Gonçalves
University of California, Los Angeles

** 98 **

Fernando de Herrera

Amor en mí se muestra ardiente fuego,
y en las entrañas de mi Luz es nieve.
Fuego no hay que ella no torne nieve,
ni nieve que no mude yo en mi fuego.
La fría zona abraso con mi fuego,
la tórrida mi Luz convierte en nieve.
Pero no puedo yo encender su nieve,
ni ella entibiar la fuerza de mi fuego.
Contrastan igualmente hielo y llama,
que fuera de otra suerte el mundo hielo,
o su máquina toda viva llama.
Mas fuera que, resuelto ya en el hielo,
o el corazón desvanecido en llama,
ni temiera mi llama ni su hielo.

Análisis de un soneto de Fernando de Herrera

"Herrera, que al Petrarca desafía."
—Lope de Vega

Heredero de la tradición italianizante iniciada en la poesía española por Boscán y Garcilaso, y precursor del gongorismo, Fernando de Herrera era también campeón de reforma ortográfica y defensor de la lengua castellana. La nueva dignidad del vernáculo debía algo al desarrollo político de la nación. El habla de la nación había desplazado al latín, y había llegado a ser instrumento de su soberanía.

En su comentario de las obras de Garcilaso, Herrera expone sus ideas para el mejoramiento de la lengua como vehículo de la poesía. Compara su idioma favorablemente con el italiano, aboga a favor de la introducción de palabras nuevas, rechaza el empleo de ciertas palabras antiguas, y llama la atención a la necesidad de perfección en el soneto.

El estudio del soneto 98 de Herrera nos pone en contacto íntimo con esta búsqueda de la perfección.

Lo primero que llama la atención en cuanto a la forma del soneto es el repetido empleo de ciertos vocablos. Estos vocablos, fuego y nieve combinados en los cuartetos, y llama y hielo en los tercetos, van a constituirse en el soporte estructural del poema.

Dice Vicente García de Diego en su edición crítica de la poesía de Herrera que éste toma el modelo para su soneto del soneto XVI de Petrarca.[1] Una comparación de los dos esquemas muestra que son parecidos aunque no idénticos:

	Pet.	Herr.		Pet.	Herr.		Pet.	Herr.
Rima:	parte	fuego	Esquema:	A	A	Palabras:	1	1
	luce	nieve		B	B		2	2
	luce	nieve		B	B		2	2
	parte	fuego		A	A		1	1
	parte	fuego		A	A		1	1
	luce	nieve		B	B		2	2
	luce	nieve		B	B		2	2
	parte	fuego		A	A		1	1
	morte	llama		C	C		3	3
	desio	hielo		D	D		4	4
	sole	llama		E	C		5	3
	morte	hielo		C	D		3	4
	desio	llama		D	C		4	3
	sole	hielo		E	D		5	4

Donde Petrarca utiliza cinco palabras, Herrera emplea cuatro, y el esquema de la rima de los tercetos queda distinto. A través de un estudio detenido del soneto veremos cuáles son los varios efectos que ejerce esta rima en la estilística y en el contenido del poema.

La distribución de vocales acentuadas es afectada desde luego por la rima y repetición de vocablos. Los diptongos de las palabras rimadas van a dominar por completo el sistema vocálico de la composición. Casi la mitad—veinticinco de un total de cincuenta y cinco—de todas las sílabas acentuadas contienen o el diptongo *ue* o *ie*. Son sonidos suaves que contrastan con otros más violentos, y crean una calma que refleja el estado semiestoico del poeta.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1		o		i		(m)ue		ie		ue	
2				a				u		ie	
3	ue			ai	e			o(r)		ie	
4		ie				(m)u		o(e)		ue	
1		i		(z)o(n)		a		o		ue	
2		o				u		ie		ie	
3			o	ue		o(e)		e(r)		ie	
4	ie			a		ue				ue	
1		a				e		ie		a	
2		ue		(e)o		ue		u		ie	
3			a			o		i		a	
1		ue				ue		a(e)		ie	
2				(z)o(n)				i		a	
3			ie			a		i		ie	

El paradigma de los sonidos invita otras observaciones. Son demasiado numerosas para comentarlas todas, pero señalaremos algunas. En cada estrofa hay fenómenos que agracian el enlace poético-fonológico. Por ejemplo, la *mu* de 'mude' en el cuarto verso recuerda la de '*mu*estra' en el primero. La *r* del acento 8 en el verso siete repite la *r* del acento 8 del tercer verso. Los acentos 8 (u) y 10 (ie) del segundo verso del primer terceto reflejan los acentos 8 (u) y 10 (ie) del segundo del primer cuarteto. En el verso trece la sílaba acentuada *zon* recuerda la *zon* del quinto verso.

Es semejantemente eficaz el empleo de aliteración: "A*m*or en *m*í se *m*uestra . . . ,"; "*n*i *n*ieve que *n*o mude . . . ,"; "Pero no puedo . . . ,"; "fuerza de mi fuego," continuando la voz poética con el juego de los diptongos. Contribuye también al lirismo del poema la alta proporción de consonantes sonoras. De 184 consonantes, 131 son sonoras, lo cual aumenta la musicalidad de la lírica.

Los endecasílabos del soneto son de arte mayor genérico. Cada verso

es una unidad sintáctica, y el ritmo es regular. La esticomitia, o sea, la ausencia de encabalgamiento, contribuye a dar estabilidad al poema. Efectivamente, parece que el equilibrio de elementos va a ser un motivo dominante en el poema, tanto en el contenido como en la forma.

Las unidades semánticas del soneto forman cuatro fases que no corresponden exactamente a las divisiones estróficas. La primera fase corresponde a los versos 1-6, la segunda a los versos 7-8, la tercera a 9-11, y la cuarta a 12-14.

Vamos a analizar el contenido del soneto fase por fase. La primera consiste en tres oraciones, cada una de las cuales ocupa dos versos y tiene una pausa al final del primer verso de cada par.

1	______________,	
2	______________.	
3	______________,	1ª fase
4	______________.	
5	______________,	
6	______________.	
7	______________,	2ª fase
8	______________.	
9	______________,	
10	______________,	3ª fase
11	______________.	
12	______,______,	
13	______________,	4ª fase
14	______________.	

La primera oración es una declaración del poeta que su amor no es correspondido por su amada Luz, y la segunda y tercera oraciones son recalcos o glosas de la primera. La segunda usa términos generales, y la tercera términos de geografía. Esta fase establece la técnica que utiliza Herrera en la composición, que es expresar su pensamiento con tres o cuatro palabras relacionadas de varias maneras distintas. La presentación es abstracta, un tanto cerebral. Hay un mínimo de acción y de descripción.

La segunda fase, una cuarta oración de dos versos, está situada exactamente a mitad del poema, y marca el clímax temático. Hasta aquí sabemos que el amor que en él arde no es correspondido. Ahora el poeta nos dice claramente que no tiene esperanzas de felicidad, que no es posible que cambien ni sus propios sentimientos ni los de ella. Y con esto quedan anuladas dos posibilidades de alivio.

Así nos tiene pensando que todo marcha fatalmente y que está condenado a una situación que no conduce a ningún fin positivo. Pero el contenido de los versos restantes muestra una actitud diferente.

En la tercera fase, que corresponde al primer terceto, ya no habla específicamente de su amor y de su amada, sino del equilibrio que hay en el mundo entre llama y hielo, e implícitamente entre fuego y nieve, y

amor e indiferencia. Lo curioso es que describe el contraste como fenómeno bueno y necesario, dejándonos concluir que no es totalmente mala la presencia del hielo. Aunque ya en la primera fase es evidente el contraste, no lo captamos como natural y positivo hasta llegar a la tercera, donde está además elevado y ennoblecido por la comparación con un equilibrio esencial de la Naturaleza.

Hemos comentado que el equilibrio de elementos es un motivo fundamental del soneto. Hay varios tipos de simetría en la forma de la composición que complementan y refuerzan la idea de equilibrio en el contenido, como ahora veremos.

Hay un ejemplo de simetría en la rima y en la colocación de las palabras rimadas:

ABBA
ABBA fuego nieve nieve fuego
CDC llama hielo llama
DCD etc.

En la distribución de los sustantivos y verbos se ve otro patrón simétrico. El primer cuarteto es un buen ejemplo:

sust. + verbo + sust.
sust. + verbo + sust.
sust. + verbo + pron. + verbo + sust.
sust. + verbo + sust.

Las imágenes 'amor=fuego, llama' e 'indiferencia=nieve, hielo,' metáforas clásicas y bíblicas,[2] toman nuevo sentido vistas como miembros armoniosos de un equilibrio natural. Además, la metáfora en sí es una imagen de equivalencias casi matemáticas.

Otro artificio sintáctico utilizado que aumenta el equilibrio estructural es la distribución de las conjunciones 'o' y 'no' hecha de tal manera que aparece una al principio del último verso de cada estrofa.

Todos estos paralelismos, repeticiones, y simetrías aumentan y subrayan el tema de equilibrio amor/fuego=indiferencia/hielo elaborado por el poeta, que en la tercera fase del poema nos ha sorprendido con su juicio sobre la beneficencia del contraste.

Encontramos otra sorpresa en la cuarta fase, que corresponde al segundo terceto, en la introducción de la posibilidad de que todavía haya escapes del sufrimiento. El terceto, así glosado por Wardropper: "But it would turn out that, if I were absorbed by the ice or if my heart disappeared in the flame, I would fear neither my flame nor her ice.",[3] declara que si fuera cumplida una condición u otra, el enamorado dejaría de temer el amor. Esta declaración de que no queda irremediablemente condenado a sufrir su miedo es un anticlímax contrapuesto al clímax ya visto en el segundo cuarteto.

Un resultado de las muchas repeticiones es un léxico de poca variedad.

Hay en el soneto una escasez de sustantivos, de verbos descriptivos, y sobre todo de adjetivos. Sólo por fuerza del número de significantes es más grande la categoría de sustantivos:

Estrofa	1	2	3	4
sustantivos	9	7	7	5
pronombres	3	2	0	0
verbos	5	5	2	4
adjetivos	1	2	2	0

Hay un total de veinticinco nombres, pero solamente doce distintos. Aunque hay menos significantes verbales que sustantivales, la variedad verbal del soneto es mayor. Sin embargo los verbos en sí no ofrecen ni descripción ni acción; son más bien copulativos: "es," "se muestra," etc. En otras palabras, el léxico está al servicio del propósito del poeta de elaborar un tema con los juegos y recursos lingüísticos ya vistos. La falta de variedad léxica no obstante, maneja cada palabra con un esmero exquisito.

La forma y el contenido de este poema de Herrera están tan íntimamente ligados que no es posible, ni siguiera deseable para el análisis, separarlos. Herrera poeta, sobresaliente en esta poesía amorosa, se prueba dueño de una técnica de extremada perfección. Es quizás en parte tal perfección que motivó a algunos críticos de los siglos XVIII y XIX a calificar el plantonismo de Herrera de frío y convencional. Hemos visto en el soneto 98 lo que pudiera provocar tal aserveración, pero también lo que anima a la crítica moderna a estimar cada vez más la voz melancólica y lírica del poeta.

Darlene Lorenz
University of California, Los Angeles

NOTAS

1. V. García de Diego, *Fernando de Herrera*, Madrid: Gredos, 1970, p. 149.
2. Estas metáforas son tópicos en las literaturas antiguas, bíblicas, y en las que las siguen. Cf. Gen. 15, 17; Mat. 3, 11-12; Apoc. 1, 14. La frialdad o "tibieza" para significar indiferencia espiritual ya está lexicalizada. Véase también los campos semánticos en el libro de Macrí, págs. 158-209; "luz," "amor," "ardor," etc.
3. B. Wardropper, *Poetry of the Golden Age*, p. 171.

ADIOS AL HOMBRE

I stand and look at them long and long.
Walt Whitman

Quisiera ser como mi gato.
Dejar, por fin, este hábito pestilente de hombre
y sin pena quemarlo para siempre.
Sentir gozoso
mi recién estrenada identidad felina,
el terso pelo negro
con una mancha blanca bajo el cuello,
la áspera lengua,
las pupilas densas
que penetran la poderosa noche.
Mansamente acercarme a mi dueño
y frotar mi espalda entre sus piernas.
E invisiblemente andar
con mis nuevas patas quedas
por el pasillo de la casa
acechando el rincón aún no conocido
y ocultándome bajo el sofá polvoriento de la sala.
Con astutos maullidos lastimeros
recabar la atención del gigantesco hombre
y, ya ahíto,
saltar a mi silla predilecta
junto al hogar
mientras fuera llueve y hace frío.
Despojado de memoria,
nunca más recordar
el infeliz pasado humano.
Dormir en paz,
sin pesadillas
de soberbia, traición o ausencia.
Vivir, meramente vivir,
sin esperar
la ansiosa muerte
y ovillarme en el jardín, bajo el naranjo,
sin saber de dios y el tiempo.
Qué placer mi nueva vida,
sin el lastre intolerable de lo humano,
sin creer
en promesas, países o mesías
ni pensarme
por treinta interminables siglos

el despiadado emperador
de todo lo existente.
Ni inventar grandes razones
ni quebrar el mundo
en ellos y nosotros
bueno y malo.
Oh, sí, dejadme aquí,
en este tibio tejado de la tarde.
Yo os concedo
vuestra superior risa de desprecio
las ínclitas razas,
el Oriente y Occidente,
todos los santos y los reyes
y los otros benefactores dadivosos de la especie
y la dura y necia indiferencia
ante la belleza el dolor y la concordia.

Gonzalo Navajas

LIMBO

Ni aquí ni allá
Colgado entre
dos mundos que
se disputan unos
despojos mal soñados

¡Sólo en el alma
se desbandan
las fronteras!

Claremont, Verano de 1978
José S. Cuervo

IMAGO

El viento viaja
en marejadas
como el resto
de los turistas
photo snapping
diluída en varias
proporciones químicas
el alma flota
rehuyendo the black
&
white
images

Claremont, Verano de 1978
José S. Cuervo

The Image of Language in Solórzano's *Las manos de Dios:* The Degradation and Subversion of Communication

Tus palabras no servirán
de nada. (p. 338)[1]

The purpose of this paper is the examination of the image of language degraded and subverted in Carlos Solórzano's *Las manos de Dios* (1956), a work that is recognized as one of the cornerstones of contemporary Latin American theater.[2]

The nature of language in Solórzano's play is double-edged. On the one hand, language is considered to be one of the most fundamental activities and certainly one of the most cohesive forces of human society. When the American Marxist critic Frederic Jameson entitles his study on Russian formalism and European structuralism *The Prison House of Language*,[3] he is taking exception to the image of language that those "schools" of linguistic and literary theory have propagated. This image of language is seen as an inalterable barrier to communication. Language structures are inherently imperfect, ambiguous, ironic and often self-defeating rather than a force that binds men together on the basis of shared and easily exchanged meaning and comprehension. Undoubtedly, contemporary linguistics is aware of the intrinsic limitations of language. Nevertheless, our society maintains an image of language as an important instrument of social interaction for the definition and transmission of the values of society and for the identification of man's place in that society.

On the other hand, Solórzano's work is an example of literary art. It is unquestionable that language is the very basis of literature and its unique textuality. Whatever literature *is* or *does*, it is first of all language, a linguistic texture that is self-identifying and is the medium of the goals and instrumentality we associate with literature. Literature is often considered a privileged form of language not only because of the "special artistic qualities" that it has historically developed and exploited in order to highlight its material uniqueness, but also because of the rather long tradition of literary theory. This theory sees in the particular organization of literature a heightened form of communication: the New Criticism postulate of literature as a "higher form of knowledge." Indeed, it is customary in contemporary criticism to respect the symbolic autonomy of literature by insisting on the way in which literature provides a particularly dramatic and emphatic representation (re-presentation) of social and historical reality. It is, of course, true that Solórzano's

work is an exemplary piece of theater. Because of its linguistic vehicularization of the aspect of Latin American social reality with which it deals, it has been an enormously successful work in its original Spanish and in translation. It is, in short, one of the most anthologized of modern Latin American plays. Nevertheless, the image of subverted language that is incorporated into the structure of *Las manos de Dios* bespeaks the manipulation and degradation of man's and society's primary instrument of communication as an all-too-effective ploy of socio-political oppression. Our interest here will be to study the manifestations of that image as integral parts of the overall configuration of the system of oppression to which the play gives such effective symbolic representation.

The degradation of language in *Las manos de Dios* is based on five principles that are identifiable as the specific system of communication subverted. This system is a "resource" in the hands of the exploiters of the people. It is also a symbolic phenomenon that is featured in the play as a foregrounded detail or index of exploitation and oppression. The five principles are inversion of meaning, leitmotifs, double meanings, incommunication or communication at cross-purposes, and silence.

By *inversion of meaning* we understand the interplay between a projected, accepted meaning for words, phrases, referents and a rupture with that conventional meaning. Instead, one finds the projection of its antonymy or at least its contradiction. The title of the play points to such a procedure.[5] The phrase "las manos de Dios" unquestionably recalls a religious tradition in which the hands of God (or of those of His saintly mediators) symbolize metonymically the spiritual succor that He provides man in this vale of tears. Or it may evoke the direct material assistance apportioned through miracles or the agency of a panoply of Divine representatives. We identify such a meaning for the title and we recognize other similar references in Solórzano's play on the basis of our familiarity with the Christian tradition in general and with the Catholic Church, particularly as it has existed historically in Latin America. This is one of the implicit levels of the text, the level that Roland Barthes identifies as the cultural or referential code of a work. This code depends on a degree of familiarity on the part of the reader-spectator with a range of established meanings that occur within the work as references or allusions.[6] For example, one can only speak of the secondary characters of the work as caricatures of a rural and still oppressively feudal Latin American reality because we have a referential image, extrinsic to the work but evoked by it implicitly, of the nature of specific oligarchic representatives and their agents of that reality.

When we speak of the inversion or rupture of the accepted meaning of a conventional referent, it is necessary that the accepted meaning be somehow signaled and recognized in order for us to perceive that a rupture has, in fact, taken place. In the case of *Las manos de Dios*, this rupture is the complete negation implied by the work of the efficacy of the "hands of God." Beatriz turns to God for relief from her and her

brother's suffering at the hands of a situation that she cannot quite comprehend. But when her prayers fail, she turns to the bejeweled hands of the institutionalized image of God in the hope that the precious stones will alleviate materially the suffering that prayers were unable to bring about. Specifically, she will use the jewels to bribe the Carcelero to set her brother free from the Amo's jail in which he is unjustly and cruelly being held. As her prayers were a failure, so is her brazen recourse to the "hands of God" from which she steals the jewels in a final desperate gesture. They become the instruments not of her salvation but of her betrayal by the town Cura, who uses those hands to set a trap for the confused woman. Rather than finding salvation through the image of God to which she turns, Beatriz sees it become the agent of her own sacrifice to the all-demeaning power of socio-political oppression.

The "hands of God" are the primary symbol of the church as an agency in Beatriz's environment. The representative of that agency, the Cura, is in turn the degradation of the established sense of the spiritual efficacy of God's hands and the entire system of human values for which He is accepted to stand. The Cura, whom one quickly realizes is more an agent of the Amo than he is a God made in the likeness of suffering humanity, confronts Beatriz. The dialogue that takes place between the two underlines the inversion of the values represented conventionally by the title of the work. There is little doubt that, as far as the Cura is concerned, neither he nor the sacred images of his church can or should offer comfort to Beatriz. (Beatriz at the same time recognizes that these images can be of no assistance to her.) As already stated, they become the very instrument of her own definitive degradation: "CURA.—¿Qué has hecho, desventurada? ¿Qué has hecho? ¡Hereje, impía, alma diabólica! ¿Cómo te has atrevido? ¿No sabes que te exponías a la ira de Dios? *(El Cura arroja a Beatriz al suelo.)*" (p. 346).

The figure of the Diablo and to a lesser degree the figure of the Cura also represent inversions of accepted linguistic and referential meaning. One of the most startling aspects of Solórzano's work, certainly one of its most original and clever features, is to present the Diablo as spokesman for honest social revolution. The Diablo is seen to embody the spiritual, social and human forces that one traditionally associates with an established institution like the church. The Diablo complains on at least one occasion of the accepted image of his nature and of his function in the transcendent order of things:

> DIABLO.—Debo advertirte que tengo dos clases de nombres. Unos han sido inventados para asustar a los hombres y hacerlos creer que no deben seguir mi ejemplo: *(Teatral.)* Mefistófeles, Luzbel, Satanás. *(Otra vez natural.)* Como si yo fuera el mal absoluto. El mal existe, por supuesto, pero yo no soy su representante. Yo sólo soy un rebelde, y la rebeldía, para mí, es el mayor bien. Quise enseñar a los hombres el por qué y el para qué de todo lo que les rodea; de lo que acontece, de lo que es y no es . . . Debo decirte que yo prefiero otros nombres, esos que aunque

> nadie me adjudica son los que realmente me pertenecen: para los griegos fui Prometeo, Galileo en el Renacimiento, aquí en tierras de América . . . Pero, bueno, he tenido tantos nombres más. *(Con un dejo de amargura.)* Los nombres cambiaron, pero yo fui siempre el mismo: calumniado, temido, despreciado y lo único que he querido siempre, a través de los tiempos, es acercarme al Hombre, ayudarle a vencer el miedo a la vida y a la muerte, la angustia del ser. *(Torturado.)* Quise hallar para la vida otra respuesta que no se estrellara siempre con las puertas cerradas de la muerte, de la nada. (pp. 315–16)

As far as the Diablo is concerned, both the traditional names associated with him and the various functions that convention has assigned to him (from the frightening of virgins to the destruction of Grace) are lies perpetrated by an institution that, because of its own unjust and unholy goals, cannot accept the human values and the quest for freedom that he embodies. One of the functions of the Diablo in *Las manos de Dios* is to awaken Beatriz to the names and symbols of the society in which she lives and that the church wholeheartedly supports, as well as to make her comprehend the values of liberation that he, the enemy, can provide. On the level of the spectator, the Diablo as he addresses the audience makes an implied appeal for the realization of the invalidity, the subverted values, of the institutions of which he is counted a mortal foe. In short, he gives the lie to an entire system evoked by the conventional references postulated by the work in its depiction of a caricaturized but nevertheless vividly real socio-political reality. That system depends on a language of verbal signs and gestures which it controls oppressively and subverts to its own degrading ends. The play of inversions one finds in both the self-characterization and the actual role that he comes to play in the work points in an emphatic fashion to the interplay between an accepted image of a well-ordered society and the inversion of that image. This is done in order to "break open" the latter and to place in its stead an image that is more viable to the attainment of man's liberaation. Here language and its symbolic representations become an instrument of revolution and social change. The words of the Diablo, words that Beatriz comes to assimilate and to put into action, are an instrument for the rupture of accepted values and symbolic representations.

In the final analysis, Beatriz is defeated and the realization of the Diablo's mission is postponed indefinitely. Nevertheless, the work does conclude on a note that prophesies his triumph through the eventual irreversible inversion—or reversion—of the degraded symbols that in their present form bespeak oppression but may ultimately augur liberation. When Beatriz invokes the central linguistic symbolization of the religion of her oppressors, she also recognizes the need to go beyond that symbol in order to attain any meaningful freedom (cf. p. 317).

In the case of the village Cura, there is less of a dramatic inversion. Of course, the work does juxtapose a positive image of the priest maintained by institutional sectors and the degraded image of the priest that

appears in the play as the agent of the all-powerful Amo (who, like a silent and absent God-head, never appears himself in the work). This image of the corrupt village priest is sufficiently well-established in Latin American culture so that it does not constitute a noteworthy innovation on Solórzano's part. What does constitute an innovation is the juxtaposition of the Cura and the Diablo, each in his own way deviating from a conventional, if false, image of his nature. This is a juxtaposition in which the interplay between the symbols that they each represent and the degradation of these symbols on the part of the Cura and their revitalization on the part of the Diablo are manifest in what becomes a "debate" between the two toward the end of the work. Both attempt to enlist the support of the townspeople, the former to condemn Beatriz and the latter to save her. In the end, the Cura is victorious as part of the final destruction of the woman and the postponement of the realization of the true, unsubverted values that the Diablo embodies. Nevertheless, in a scene near the end of the play—remarkable for its incorporation of the effects of total theater in which we see representatives of the people pantomime their vacillation between the two poles represented by the Cura and the Diablo—we witness the eloquent antiphony of the two opposing value systems (pp. 353–55).

The second principle of language degraded and subverted in *Las manos de Dios* concerns the use of *leitmotifs* and other forms of *stereotyped expression*. Although rhetorical formulas, leitmotifs and stereotyped expression in general are not devoid of meaning, because of the repetition of set diction, these phrases do, in fact, often lose the lexical value of their constituent parts and take on a global function as "discourse tags." In this sense, they function less as elements of significant discourse and more as constituents of phatic communication: communication that is not meaning-oriented, but rather serves to overcome silence between human beings. Salutations are good examples of this type of linguistic marker since they are not meant to be understood at the literal level of their semantic meaning (i.e., *adiós* is no longer understood as *a Dios*). When such phatic markers serve a higher goal than immediate semantic meaning, like interpersonal solidarity, they are functional in a way that transcends language. But when they do not serve such higher functions, these tags remain vacuous and threaten both communication and solidarity by postponing the former and mocking the latter. The linguistic expression of the Cura, the Sacristan, and the Carcelero—all agents to varying degrees of the Amo—is pregnant with clichés, especially when reference is made to questions involving morals and values. Initially the expression of Beatriz is highly stereotyped. This expression is juxtaposed to the radically threatening expression of the Diablo. Beatriz soon abandons the meaningless clichés of the institutions that oppress her. This abandonment is an index of the degree of spiritual if not actual liberation that she comes to attain. In the "debate" between the Cura and the Diablo in which each attempts to win the allegiance

of the confused populace, the phrases manipulated by the Cura are leitmotifs of his profession and stereotyped formulas of the institution he represents: "La ira de Dios caerá sobre este pueblo por haber escuchado al enemigo;" "Que la voluntad de Dios se cumpla sobre ella;" "Esta iglesia es la seguridad, hijos míos." These and other similar formulas, by virtue of their constant repetition, evoke stock emotional responses and serve to thwart serious thought concerning the issues of human destiny.

One of the best markers in the work of the dominance of stereotyped expression uttered by the agents of oppression occurs when the Cura confronts Beatriz in the previously quoted passage. When the Cura asks her "¿No sabes que te exponías a la ira de Dios?" Beatriz does not respond directly to the question. Rather, she reacts to the words themselves and not their content: "Desde que nací he oído esas palabras. ¿Podría ignorarlas ahora?" Beatriz is demanding the right to dissociate herself not from the meaning of the words, but from the hoary formula that those words constitute. At the beginning of the second act, there is a confrontation between the Carcelero and the Prostitute, whose favors the former hopes to gain through Beatriz's ransom for her brother's freedom. The Carcelero is a lesser agent of the omnipresent Amo, and the Prostitute becomes fed up with the nagging but vacuous litany of self-justification that the Carcelero recites to her (cf. p. 327).

Finally, toward the end of the second act, when Beatrix continues to vacillate between her formation within a system that denies her freedom and the release from oppression that the Diablo offers her, she relapses into a series of clichés that have been learned from the Cura. The Diablo's response is charged with irony, while at the same time he makes references to what a repudiation of those clichés could represent (pp. 324–25).

The third principle of language degradation involves *double meanings*. To a certain extent, the interplay of double meanings identifies itself with the first principle discussed, whereby a second meaning replaces antithetically an original, more obvious one. However, examples of double meaning are in and of themselves ironic. They represent a type of language foregrounding that calls into question the meanings of the words themselves. For example, there is a clever transition between the fourth and fifth scenes of the first act in which words referring to the Diablo are used with one meaning but are used by the Diablo himself (at this point identified as the Forastero) in quite another sense (cf. p. 314). The Diablo's words may not suggest an unconscious second meaning at this point in the play. However, retroflexively in terms of the development of the elements established at the outset of the text, one understands what the true meaning of "Enemigos" is and to what extent the phrase "Los servidores del Señor" is true—or false. For it is unquestionable that *Las manos de Dios* proposes that the representatives of order are man's true enemy. "Los servidores del Señor" in reality means

"Los servidores—los testaferros—del Amo." All works of literature involve double-meaning irony of this sort in the sense that references made early on or at successive points in a text only possess their full contextual meaning when seen in terms of the fulfillment of the work's structure. Nevertheless, I am referring here to a verbal texture that Solórzano confers upon his drama as part of his analogous subversion of a language that has been degraded by the agents of oppression whom he presents in the play.

The fourth principle of language subversion concerns *lack of communication* or *short-circuited communication*. There are two major examples in *Las manos* of this lack of communication, and it is significant to note that they are structured in incremental fashion. In the fourth scene of the first act, Beatriz visits the Carcelero in the vain attempt to persuade him to free her brother. It has been noted how the Carcelero is a representative of unjust authority to the second degree seeing that he is much more dependent on the Amo than is the Cura. The Cura is more an instrument of oppression that the Carcelero, whose position allows him to be the perpetrator of injustice. In the conversation between Beatriz and the Carcelero, although on a superficial level there appears to be a "fit" between their respective speeches and the questions and answers that they direct to each other, it becomes obvious that no effective communication takes place and that the two of them are speaking at cross-purposes. It is truly a *diálogo de sordos.* At one point Beatriz attempts to elicit some sort of rational explanation from the Carcelero for what has happened to her brother. The Carcelero, however, is unwilling or unable to satisfy her questions, which therefore remain suspended (pp. 311–14). The Carcelero's final words indicate that as far as he is concerned, speech, communication and dialogue are superfluous within the context of the order that he represents. Later, in the same encounter, Beatriz begs permission to speak to her brother. The Carcelero denies her request, a denial based on an overriding principle of the Amo's prohibition of speech and communication.

The Carcelero, unable to handle the dialogue that the overwrought woman insists on maintaining, only has recourse to the abrupt and conclusive command "Cállate" (p. 313). Beatriz, in turn, only acknowledges that human speech has failed. Yet, this encounter extends beyond the Carcelero's command. Beatriz continues to ply him with frenzied but useless questions, which for the Carcelero are to be avoided or met indirectly with meaningless responses. Throughout the play there are numerous examples of orders for silence, commands that insist on the termination of the attempt at communication and meaningful dialogue. These commands constitute the tacit acknowledgement that communication within the socio-political environment of the characters is useless. Such an order for silence occurs in the very first scene of the play when the Campanero tells the Sacristán that he has seen a stranger with all of the physical features of Satan. The Sacristán orders him to be quiet,

as though such a command were capable of banishing an unpleasant truth. Reasoned discussion of what the Campanero has seen is therefore effectively precluded, although we realize that his inebriated vision is a communicable fact. Later in the first scene, the Campanero, aware of the Sacristán's authority and his fear of the potentially accurate news that the former has brought, accepts the Sacristan's order to be quiet. The Sacristán's truth becomes the only one possible, as all other opinion is cancelled out by the demand for silence: "Está bien. Si Ud. lo dice, así debe ser" (p. 307). From the very outset of the work, the impossibility and the impertinence of reasoned dialogue concerning events is excluded from the world of these individuals.

The second major example of incommunication or short-circuited communication occurs in the second act when Beatriz visits the Cura in the futile attempt to elicit his help after having failed in an analogous appeal to the Carcelero. The spiritual leader of the people and the purported spokesman for authentic human values is an intensification of the earlier encounter with the representative of civil justice. The Cura refuses to discuss with Beatriz the real purpose of her visit. He also insists on substituting in the place of a discussion of her legitimate spiritual and material preoccupations a series of stereotyped references to the behavior expected from a docile parishioner who subscribes blindly to the articles of a faith that is incapable of dealing with the real bases of human suffering. In place of Beatriz's confession that she understands nothing of what has befallen her, the Cura, by rejecting her pleas for direct assistance, closes off any further communication between them. He insists that his role does not involve understanding, (cf. p. 332).

I have already quoted from the subsequent encounter in the third act between Beatriz and the Cura in which he confronts her with the proof of her sin and Beatriz attempts to explain what she has done. Once again, communication between the two is impossible. Following that encounter, it only remains for the Cura to take the steps necessary to bring about the final destruction of the woman as an individual who would challenge his authority.

Confronted with the impossibility of communication and the futile attempts at communication that lead to misunderstanding, the option available to the individual is silence. *Silence* constitutes in *Las manos de Dios* the fifth principle of language degradation. Language becomes subverted to the point where it is no longer useful for the purposes of social interaction and therefore can be eliminated as superfluous.

This silence is most vividly portrayed by the Coro *(sic!)* de Hombres and the Coro de Mujeres, which, in accordance with Brechtian principles, act as pantomimic figures attesting to the "oppression unto silence" that is their common lot.[7] It is a silence that reveals their inability to free themselves from the unjust authority wielding the subverted word that dominates them.[8] When the Forastero-Diablo first appears

in the third scene of the first act, he attempts to establish communication. These attempts are frustrated by the people, and he is astonished by their hermetic silence (cf. pp. 310–11).

Silence assumes another perspective at the end of the first act. The Diablo, still identified as the Forastero, endeavors to persuade Beatriz to act on behalf of her own salvation and that of her brother. He refers to silence—in this case, the silence of the religious image that represents the authority and the uncomprehending nature of the people's soul. Beatriz, the one individual who has broken the silence of the masses and expressed her torment and her quest for liberation, is confronted with an institutionalized symbol that is itself locked in an impenetrable silence (p. 323).

Since the Cura and the institution that he represents are the bearers of the Word, used as an instrument of oppressive deceit, any member of the people who would aspire to use that Word must be reduced to a passive, primeval silence. There is unquestionably an ironic interplay between the Word and Silence, the subversion of language and the quest for communication, and language as an instrument of oppression and language as the vehicle of a legitimate rebellion against the silence imposed by the degradation of the Word. The image of silence is once again the silence of the masses as the work concludes with the debate between the Cura and the Diablo in which the latter fails to enlist the people's support. Their relapse into silence is an "eloquent" index of the Diablo's failure and the renewed triumph of the Cura and his legions, and true Enemy of Man. In their restored silence, the masses become deaf to the challenge contained in the rebellious message that the Diablo tries so furtively to communicate (cf. pp. 355–57).

In summary, I see in the subversion, the degredation and the denial of language a vivid portrayal of the rejection of the Word and its efficacy in a world dominated by corrupt authority and unjust human oppression. If *Las manos de Dios* doubts the legitimacy of the Diablo's message and accepts the debased word of the Cura, it is because the structures of oppression remain too strong for the onslaught of the Diablo's rebellion. Nevertheless, the work concludes with an intense affirmation of the possibility for the triumph of the values that the Diablo embodies. It is significant to note that the play closes with a moving exchange of "authentic" communication between Beatriz and her temporarily defeated mentor:

> DIABLO.—Lo único que logré fue sacrificarte a ti. ¡Para eso es para lo único que he servido!
>
> BEATRIZ.—*(Con voz entrecortada.)* No estés triste. Ahora comprendo que el verdadero bien eres tú.
>
> DIABLO.—*(Sollozando.)* He perdido tantas veces esta batalla de la rebeldía y cada vez me sube el llanto al pecho como si fuera la primera. El viento del Norte moverá tu cuerpo, pobre Beatriz, y golpeará en la

ventana de la celda del Hombre, que sigue prisionero. *(Patético.)* No volveré a luchar más. Nunca más.

BEATRIZ.—*(Casi sin poder hablar.)* Sí. Volverás a luchar. Prométeme que lo harás por mí. Algún día se cansarán de creer en el viento y sabrán que sólo es imposible lo que ellos no quieran alcanzar. Su misma voluntad es el viento, con que hay que envolver la superficie completa de esta tierra. *(Se desfallece. El viento sopla furioso, agitando los vestidos y cabellos de Beatriz.)*

DIABLO.—*(Impotente).* ¡Ya no puedo hacer nada por ti! *(Se levanta y se acerca a Beatriz y la llama inútilmente.)* ¡Beatriz! . . . *(Pausa. La sacude con desesperación. De pronto, reacciona otra vez con energía.)* Está bien . . . Seguiré luchando; libraré de nuevo la batalla, en otro lugar, en otro tiempo, y algún día, tú muerta y yo vivo, seremos los vencedores. *(Abre los brazos como si fuera a comenzar el vuelo. El tema musical del Demonio suena ahora dramático, mezclado con el rumor del viento.)* (p. 358)

It would not be adequate for Solórzano to offer a work in which one finds only the image of language degraded and subverted along with the profound human values that language is assumed to serve. Rather, I insist that an author committed to those human values should offer the notion of a "recuperation" or "restoration" of true language and values.

Throughout the play—and in counterpoint to the various principles of language gone awry that are discussed in the previous section—one witnesses the development of a basis of understanding through self-realization and its expression through language in Beatriz's acceptance of liberating rebellion. I have already sufficiently quoted the encounters between the two so as not to have to insist on the emergence of the woman's commitment. Early in the work, Beatriz and the Diablo speak at cross-purposes and the former relies on clichés of religious sentiment that betray the structure of oppression to which she has been subject. However, Beatriz develops under the tutelage of the Diablo the capacity to understand her situation and how it may be remedied. The culmination of her growing awareness is the final exchange between Beatriz and the Diablo already quoted. Beatriz's expression goes far beyond the sort of language which she initially has at her disposal. True human speech has been recovered through the awakening that she has experienced.

Similarly, Beatriz's spiritual liberation is correlated with the decision to act in accordance with the nature of her plight. The Diablo urges Beatriz to commit an act of defiance resulting in freedom, an action that he sees as replacing the empty gesture of prayer that depends on the stereotyped language of the Cura (pp. 322–23). The ideal that the Diablo embodies is in the end frustrated. In the scene in which the Diablo and the Cura engage in the struggle of words we see the former's insistence on action as a necessary remedy for the corruption of meaningful human language. The Diablo affirms his belief that Beatriz's acts of defiance must be effective in jolting the oppressed people into an understanding of their own degradation.

Although the plans of the Diablo remain frustrated by the still potent forces against which he must struggle, the work leaves a clear image of a form of defiant action that is revolutionary and capable of shattering the bonds imposed by degraded language. It also illustrates an image of comprehension and awareness based on the rescue of language from its manipulation by the agents of oppression and its restoration to a primeval role. All works of literature are founded on forms of rupture with colloquial speech.[9] We associate literature with the ability to go beyond the worn and ritualized patterns of communication on which daily speech depends. Linguistic rupture in literary works serves to enhance the meaning of language and the reality to which it gives symbolic form. Our attention is called to that reality in a manner of which the clichés of daily speech are no longer capable.

In *Las manos de Dios*, Solórzano's patterns of linguistic rupture involve an expressionistic representation of the degradation of human speech by oppressive agents, who in perceiving language as a threat to their control have no choice but to subvert it. Solórzano's work projects a view of the potential restoration of language to its role in the enhancement of human solidarity. This salutory image of language is coupled with appropriate revolutionary action. The Diablo uses the true potential of language to persuade Beatriz to put into effect her unarticulated quest for liberation. That the Diablo, in the last analysis, is unable to persuade the entire populace is an emphatic expression of the work that remains for him to do. Yet, Solórzano's play bears eloquent witness to the efficacy of language, stripped of the baseness of daily, unreflexive speech in a degraded Latin American reality, to communicate profound human values and sentiments.[10] For, although in terms of individuals within the work the debasement of language testifies to their continued oppression, in terms of the audience there is no failure to grasp the impressive power of the word as manifested in this oustanding example of Latin American dramatic literature.

David William Foster
Arizona State University

NOTES

1. All quotes are from Solórzano's anthology, *El teatro hispanoamericano contemporáneo* (México, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1964), II, 301–58. Note should also be taken of the following edition: *Teatro* (San José, C.F.: Editorial Universitaria Centroamericano, EDUCA, 1972).

2. There are a number of studies on Solórzano's theater that are both informative and perceptive. Yet, all are thematic in focus and do not deal with the sort of structural issues raised in this paper. See, in particular, Esteban Rivas, *Carlos Solórzano y el teatro hispanoamericano* (México, D.F.: Ediciones de Andrea, 1970); Frank N. Dauster, "The Drama of Carlos Solórzano," *Modern Drama*, 7 (May 1964), 89–100; Frank N. Dauster,

"Hacia el teatro nuevo: un novel autor dramático," *Hispania*, 41 (1958), 170–72; Frank N. Dauster, "El teatro vanguardista de Carlos Solórzano," in XI Congreso del Instituto Internacional de Literatura Iberoamericana, *Memoria* . . . (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1965), pp. 89–95; Margarita Ruiz Regalado, "Cuatro obras de Carlos Solórzano," *Conjunto*, No. 17 (1973), 107–109; Peter J. Schoenbach, "La libertad en *Las manos de Dios*," *Latin American Theatre Review*, 3/2 (1970), 21–29; Douglas Radcliff-Umstead, "Solórzano's Tormented Puppets," *Latin American Theatre Review*, 4/2 (1971), 5–11.

3. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1972.

4. The degradation of language as a correlate of the degradation of social reality is discussed in terms of the contemporary Latin American novel by Jaime Giordano, "El nivel de la escritura en la narrativa hispanoamericana contemporánea," *Nueva narrativa hispanoamericana*, 4 (1974), 307–44. Although a comprehensive investigation has yet to be undertaken concerning the image of language in contemporary Latin American fiction. I am confident that the image of language degraded and subverted will figure prominently.

5. For a summary of the plot of *Las manos*, see Rivas (pp. 105–106).

6. See his S/Z (New York: Hill and Wang, 1974), pp. 18–20.

7. The issue of the manipulation and control of language as a prime technique for oppression is an aspect of Augusto Roa Bastos's novel *Yo el Supremo* (1974) in which the overwhelming discourse of the nineteenth-century tyrant subverts language—and, thereby, reality and myth—and drowns out all competing discourse. See Beatriz Sarlo, "Yo el Supremo: el discurso el poder," *Los libros*, No. 38 (1974), 30–31.

8. On expressionistic elements in Solórzano's work, see Rivas, pp. 44–46. Raúl Castagnino underlines Brechtian features which are derived from early expressionist theater in his (rather superficial) semiotic analysis in *Semiótica, ideología y teatro hispanoamericano contemporáneo* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Nova, 1974), pp. 107–24.

9. Concerning rupture of language structure in literary works, see the general comments by Yury Lotman, *Analysis of the Poetic Text* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Ardis, 1976), "The Alien Word' in the Poetic Text," pp. 107–13. Graciela N. Nicci, in her essay on "La búsqueda del sentido: cinco momentos y un método," in Centro de Estudios Latinoamericanos, *Hacia una critica literaria latinoamericana* (Buenos Aires: Fernando García Cambeiro, 1976), pp. 133–66, observes that "La primera (perspectiva de un metodo analítico) consiste en detectar el grado de ruptura de la conexión arbitraria y convencional que presentan los significados en su aproximación a los respectivos significantes [. . .]. La segunda, en detectar esta ruptura pero en sentido inverso, de significante a significado, y en dos órdenes distintos: en el morfológico (modificando las formas existentes y/o creando otras nuevas), y en el semántico (desplazando el significante arbitrario y literal por otro figurado y motivado)" (p. 162). A statement on rupture in art in general is provided by Noé Jitrik, "Arte, violencia, ruptura," in his *Producción literaria y producción social* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudameriana, 1975), pp. 65–81.

10. The role of Latin American theater in the development of a revolutionary culture is studied by Virginia Ramos Foster, "Variations of Latin American Third World Drama," *Latin American Literary Review*, No. 3 (1973), 35–43; and Judith I. Bissett, *Consciousness-Raising Dramatic Structures in Latin America's Theater of Commitment* (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Arizona State University, 1976).

LISTA DE PUBLICACIONES RECIENTES

Giovanni Battista de Cesare, *Specchio Nell'Ombra*, Bulzoni Editore, Roma, 1978, 173 pp.
Juan Bautista Avalla-Arce, *Dintorno de una época dorada*, Ediciones José Porrua Turanzas, Madrid, 1978, 440 pp.
Carmen Boullosa, *El hilo olvida*, La Máquina de Escribir, México, 1978, 16 pp.
José María Espinosa, *Son de cartón*, La Máquina de Escribir, México, 1978, 23 pp.
Enrique Espinosa, *El acercamiento*, Joaquín Mortiz, México, 1978, 396 pp.
Isabel Fraire, *Poemas en el regazo de la muerte*, Joaquín Mortiz, México, 1977, 85 pp.
Julio Frenk, *Triptofanito*, Joaquín Mortiz, México, 1978, 115 pp.
Emiliano González, *Los sueños de la bella durmiente*, Joaquín Mortiz, México, 1978, 218 pp.
Alberto Huerta, *Ojalá estuvieras aquí*, Joaquín Mortiz, México, 1978, 89 pp.
Jorge Ibargüengoitia, *El atentado*, Joaquín Mortiz, México, 1978, 80 pp.
Augusto Monterroso, *Lo demás es silencio*, Joaquín Mortiz, México, 1978, 187 pp.
Héctor Morales Saviñón, *Mejor el recuerdo*, Joaquín Mortiz, México, 1978, 200 pp.
Hugo Niño, *Primitivos relatos contados otra vez, Casa de Las Américas*, La Habana, 1976, 149 pp.
Horacio Peña, *Ars Moriendi y otros poemas*, Editorial Unión, Managua, 1967, 70 pp.
Horacio Peña, *El enemigo de los poetas y otros cuentos*, Editorial Texto Ltda., San José, 1976, 110 pp.
Horacio Peña, *Las memorias de Beowulf*, Editorial Unión, Managua, 1978, 65 pp.
Horacio Peña, *Ruben Darío y Walt Whitman*, (Separata de la Revista "Encuentro" Número 12), Universidad Centroamericana, Managua, 30 pp.
Marco Ramirez Murzi, *Viento del oeste*, Zona Torrida, Caracas, 1977, 92 pp.
Fernando Rodríguez, *Cantos para un oficio de tinieblas*, Cuadernos de Estraza, México.
Auturo Serrando-Plaja, *¿Es la religión el opio del pueblo?*, Ediciones José Porrua Turanzas, Madrid, 1978, 146 pp.
Emilio Sosa López, *El visionario*, Joaquín Mortiz, México, 1978, 188 pp.
Alejandro Witker Velásquez, *Los trabajos y los días de Recabarren*, Casa de Las Américas, La Habana, 1977, 201 pp.



Revista literaria de enfoque
crítico y creativo
dedicada a las literaturas
hispanoamericana, chicana, española y luso-brasileña

VOLUMEN VI | MAYO DE 1977 | NÚMERO 2

ÍNDICE

VOLUMEN VII MAYO DE 1978 NÚMEROS 1 Y 2

ÍNDICE

